



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, September 10, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God omnipotent, only Thou art the hope of our distracted world in the disaster the wrath of men hath brought upon it. Though the people imagine a vain thing Thou still art God, Thy mercy endureth through all human denials and betrayals. As we see Thy righteous sentence swiftly overcoming the ungodly, we know that for us and for all who sin against the light of truth Thy judgment is not postponed to some far-off future day. Give us to know that upon the slopes of the Sinai of Thy immutable law our feet stand, that even now the books are open and the thrones set. Make plain to our understanding that our legislative enactments and our economic adjustments in themselves cannot bring social salvation except as they clear the way for that spiritual strength without which we labor in vain, without which all else is as futile props against a decaying house that the Lord hath not made.

In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, September 10, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3907) to provide for administration of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 by a Surplus Property Administrator, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

NOTICE OF DISPLAY OF JAPANESE SURRENDER DOCUMENTS

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I have been requested to announce to the Senate that at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, Wednesday, September 12, the Japanese

surrender documents will be placed on public display in the exhibition hall of the National Archives. Speaker RAYBURN will serve as master of ceremonies and the Japanese surrender documents will be unveiled by Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright. The ceremonies will be broadcast by several of the networks and local stations. The Archivist of the United States has requested me to extend a cordial invitation to all Members of the Senate to attend this historic ceremony. Those attending should enter by the Pennsylvania Avenue door by 10:50 a. m. and go to the conference room.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Guffey	Morse
Andrews	Gurney	Murdock
Austin	Hart	Murray
Bailey	Hatch	O'Daniel
Ball	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hayden	Overton
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Brewster	Hill	Reed
Briggs	Hoey	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Burton	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Byrd	Knowland	Smith
Capper	La Follette	Stewart
Carville	Lucas	Taft
Chandler	McCarran	Taylor
Connally	McClellan	Tobey
Cordon	McFarland	Tunnell
Donnell	McKellar	Vandenberg
Downey	McMahon	Wagner
Ellender	Magnuson	Walsh
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
Fulbright	Mead	White
George	Millikin	Wiley
Gerry	Moore	Young

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEP-
PER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from In-

diana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

JURISDICTION OVER WATERWAY, RIVER, AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—RESOLUTIONS OF COMMON COUNCILS OF MANITOWOC AND STURGEON BAY, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today I received through the mail resolutions adopted by the Common Council of the City of Manitowoc and the Common Council of the City of Sturgeon Bay, both in the State of Wisconsin. These resolutions respectfully urge the Congress to retain jurisdiction over waterway, river, and harbor improvements in the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. I ask unanimous consent to present the resolutions and that they be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions presented by Mr. WILEY were received and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

MEDICAL CENTER AND VETERANS' HOSPITAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD resolutions recently adopted at the twenty-seventh annual convention of the Department of the District of Columbia of the American Legion, memorializing Congress to enact legislation for the erection of a new modern medical center and veterans' hospital for the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas pursuant to a request of the Department Commander, your Department Committee on Veterans' Administration Affairs has conducted an extensive survey of existing veterans' hospital facilities in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas as a result of this survey it has been found that while present requirements of veterans for hospitalization within the District of Columbia are met by existing facilities, but with the known plan of the armed forces to discharge at least 2,000,000 men during the current year, it is apparent that the local daily patient load will, within the near future, increase to such an extent as to render present Veterans' Administration hospital facilities, within the District

of Columbia, totally inadequate: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the twenty-seventh annual convention of the Department of the District of Columbia of the American Legion do memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to enact proper legislation for the erection of a new modern medical center and veterans' hospital for the District of Columbia, said hospital to contain not less than the 800 beds to be used for general medical and surgical cases and to be erected within the District of Columbia; be it further

Resolved, That this, the twenty-seventh annual convention of the Department of the District of Columbia, American Legion, do memorialize the Veterans' Administration of the United States to assist by all proper action the purposes of this resolution; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the chairman of the proper committees of the House of Representatives of the United States of America, the Senate of the United States of America, and to the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration.

PROTEST AGAINST NATURALIZATION OF HARRY BRIDGES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD resolutions adopted by Charles Earnest Scott Post, No. 47, the American Legion, Dodge City, county of Ford, Kans., suggesting that Harry Bridges is an undesirable alien and protesting against approval of his application for citizenship. I have received similar resolutions from Woodson Post, No. 13, Yates Center, and Ellsworth Post, No. 174, Ellsworth, Kans.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred to the Committee on Immigration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Harry Bridges is an agitator and an undesirable alien—

Who has been guilty of and participated in subversive activities against the people and Government of the United States;

Who has called, aided, and abetted unlawful strikes, fostered strife and violence in labor and essential war industries, and otherwise interfered with the war effort in the present emergency;

Who is a member or affiliated with a party or organization advocating the overthrow of the duly constituted authority and Government of the United States and its people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Charles Earnest Scott Post, No. 47, of the American Legion, of Kansas, located at Dodge City, county of Ford, State of Kansas, in regular meeting assembled:

First. That the Charles Earnest Scott Post, No. 47, of the American Legion, of Kansas, protests against the naturalization of Harry Bridges as a citizen of the United States, demands that his application for citizenship be denied, and requests that the Governor of the State of Kansas, and the Senators and Representatives from Kansas in Congress, leave nothing undone to secure a denial of the application of Harry Bridges for citizenship.

Second. That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Governor of the State of Kansas, to each Senator and Representative from Kansas in Congress, and to the Department of the American Legion of Kansas.

Unanimously passed and adopted this 2d day of August 1945.

C. R. HARNER,

Commander, Charles Earnest Scott Post, No. 47.

Attest:

C. M. REDFIELD,
Acting Adjutant.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1353. A bill to provide for administration of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 by a Surplus Property Administrator; without amendment (Rept. No. 557).

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

S. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution favoring an extension of the air-transportation system in the United States to small cities and towns; without amendment.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 1378. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1379. A bill to provide for the payment of accumulative or accrued leave to certain members of the military and naval forces of the United States, who enter or reenter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories, or possessions, or the District of Columbia, before the expiration of such leave; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1380. A bill to amend section 15 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, so as to afford to producers an opportunity to reacquire products of their own manufacture; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 1381. A bill to provide for the payment of retired pay to certain retired judges of the police and municipal courts of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1382. A bill for the relief of Dr. Herbert M. Greene; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution dealing with the future reception of the flag which waved over the Capitol Building when war was declared, and then was raised over Rome, over Berlin, was flown on the battleship *Missouri*, and later was raised over Tokyo. The joint resolution provides that appropriate recognition be given the flag. I ask that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on the Library.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BREWSTER (for himself, Mr. HILL, and Mr. CORDON):

S. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to provide for a proper ceremony commemorating the flag which flew over the Capitol on declaration of war against Japan, Germany, and Italy, and which has now been flown in those surrendered countries, and for the creation of a commission to provide a proper celebration of such flag and to preserve and perpetuate war flags and symbols and all the records pertaining thereto; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to voting qualifications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC AIRPORTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McMAHON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2) to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 3907) to provide for administration of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 by a Surplus Property Administrator, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CARVILLE AND ARTICLE FROM THE CHICAGO HERALD-AMERICAN

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Conservation and Development of Our Natural Resources, delivered by Senator CARVILLE at the National Governors' Conference at Mackinac Island, July 3, 1945, and an article from the Chicago Herald-American of August 20, 1945, containing extracts from the address, which appear in the Appendix.]

SIXTY MILLION JOBS—REVIEWS OF BOOK WRITTEN BY HENRY A. WALLACE

[Mr. MILLIKIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Senator TAFT reviewing the book *Sixty Million Jobs*, written by Secretary of Commerce Henry A. Wallace; and Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed a review of the same book by Senator PEPPER, which reviews appear in the Appendix.]

THE RISE OF THE UNITED STATES—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Rise of the United States," by Walter Lippmann, published in the Washington Post of September 11, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC AIRPORTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2) to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] on page 29, to strike out lines 4 to 8, inclusive.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I propose an amendment on page 36, line 25, to insert the following:

Provided such funds shall also be available for the development of class 4 and larger airports upon the initiative and upon the approval of the respective State airport agencies having jurisdiction.

This amendment purports to allow the State agencies to use a part of the 65 percent fund which would be allocated for class 1, 2, and 3 airports in the respective States, to supplement any amounts which might be provided by Congress for the development of class 4 and 5 airports.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At the present time the amendment is not in order. If the Senator from Michigan will ask permission, it can be printed and lie on the table, and be taken up later.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will ask the Senator in charge of the bill—

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Can the Senator from Michigan at this time ask and receive unanimous consent that the Brewster amendment, so called, be set aside until we consider the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan? I wish to say in that regard, that I intend to accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am very happy to note that the Senator from Nevada, representing, I think, the committee viewpoint, is moving in the direction, as the amendment proposes, of more direct State responsibility, with the principle of which I am in complete accord. I am happy the Senator is willing to accept the amendment to the committee amendment, and I shall be equally happy to accept it as an amendment to the amendment which I have proposed, if it is necessary. I am not clear that it is necessary. I shall certainly have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment proposed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 36, line 25, to insert the following:

Provided such funds shall also be available for the development of class 4 and larger airports upon the initiative and upon the approval of the respective State airport agencies having jurisdiction.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if I may give a word of explanation as to what the amendment would do in connection with the general philosophy of the bill, it would permit the States to engage in the construction of class 4 or class 5 airports, and it would permit them to divert or utilize some part of the 65 percent which is provided for State airport construction, into the construction of class 4 or class 5 airports, if in the opinion of the State aeronautic agency and in the opinion of the Administrator it were proper to do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. How does that differ from the bill which is now being considered?

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill now limits the construction of airports by States to classes 1, 2, and 3 airports.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the bill, as it now stands, none of the 65-percent allocation could be used except for class 1, 2, and 3 airports?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amendment would permit the use of a part of the 65 percent for class 4 and class 5 airports?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; it would permit a State to use a portion of its allot-

ment of 65 percent for the construction of class 4 or class 5 airports.

Mr. ELLENDER. How would it affect the jurisdiction of cities in building airports?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not at all.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is true also, I think, that under the bill now before the Senate, as submitted by the committee, class 4 and class 5 funds, the 35-percent fund, may not be fully allocated for that program, but some portion of the 35 percent might be turned over to the State program for smaller airports under the 65 percent.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there is no objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine will be temporarily set aside. Is there objection?

Mr. BREWSTER. Before that is done, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan whether or not he would prepare an appropriate amendment, if necessary, which would cover the same provision in the amendment I have proposed.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall prepare such an amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have no objection to what is proposed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. What effect would this amendment, which deals only with the 65 percent, have upon the provisions of the bill regarding the 35 percent?

Mr. McCARRAN. The 35-percent provision would remain exactly as it is, and the cities would have the same authority; they could deal directly with the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is my understanding also.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the event the amendment should be agreed to and a city should initiate and sponsor a class 4 or class 5 airport, would the State authority, under the Senator's amendment, be authorized to supplement the city's funds and help it to build a class 4 or class 5 airport if the State authority saw fit to do so?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, the city could either build one itself through the cooperation of the State and the Federal Government, or the State could help a local community to construct a class 4 or class 5 airport?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is my understanding.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is my understanding also.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan for the consideration of his amendment? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment, which will again be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the amendment of the committee on page 36, line 25, it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided such funds shall also be available for development of class 4 and larger airports upon the initiative and upon the

approval of the respective State airport agencies having jurisdiction.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] on page 29, to strike out lines 4 to 8, inclusive.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in order that the Senate may understand what would be wrought by the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], I wish to say that if the amendment is adopted it will mean the complete destruction of the philosophy of the bill. The Senator from Maine admits that his amendment is offered under one philosophy, while the bill has been constructed and reported by the committee in the way of a compromise between two philosophies, one being advocated by a group which wants all the money channeled through the State, so that a city must go to the State and ask if it may have a class 4 airport or a class 5 airport, or any other airport. The other philosophy is that a certain percentage, to wit, 35 percent of the money appropriated by Congress, shall be set aside by the Administrator to be called for by municipalities or local subdivisions of a State, to be negotiated for directly between the municipality and the Federal Government, without going to and through the State. Between those two contending factions, the Governors on one side and the mayors on the other, the committee brought out this compromise by which we gave to the cities or municipalities or independent municipal agencies in the States 35 percent of the amount that Congress might appropriate each year. In other words, if Congress appropriates \$100,000,000 this year for construction of airports, then 35 percent is immediately set aside to be called for by municipalities to build class 4 or class 5 airports. Sixty-five percent is allocated to the States, which control the construction of class 1, 2, and 3 airports.

Under the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], which has just been adopted, there is another compromise worked out, and I am entirely content with it. Let me use as illustration the State of the Senator from Michigan. Let us say the city of Detroit wants to construct a class 4 or a class 5 airport. Under the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, Detroit may call upon the State of Michigan and ask the State to allocate money from its part of the 65 percent to aid in the construction of the Detroit airport. But it leaves the city of Detroit at all times free to act on its own initiative if it sees fit. In other words, the city of Detroit, in place of going to the State authorities for the money, could go directly to the Federal agency and deal directly with it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate the Senator's solicitude for Detroit, but it is also true that under Federal operation hitherto Detroit probably has the worst and most dangerous airport in the

country, a situation which I think not only every State but every intelligent authority ought to recognize. Yet we have been pouring money into certain other metropolitan areas which are far less in need of airport development. So it seems to me that the Detroit example which the Senator so aptly makes—Chicago would present an almost similar situation—argues for bringing in the State as well as local enterprise in the effort to develop the airports which those areas certainly need.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall not pass on the condition of the airport at Detroit, because I know nothing about it; but, if it is in the condition mentioned by the Senator from Maine, it is a matter which the Federal authorities could have looked into and which the authorities of the State of Michigan or of Detroit could have looked into a long time ago.

My desire—and I solicit the attention of the Senate to it—is to carry out the philosophy of the bill as it came from the committee. It is a compromise bill. We hope that we will not go to one side or the other too far. In other words, we want to compromise between the two theories, the one being the theory that all money should be channeled through the State, and the other theory being that a municipality should be able to go directly to the Federal Government. That situation is not impaired by the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, and it is the one thing we want to preserve, which in turn would be destroyed by the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I want to ask the Senator from Nevada a question. If the bill is passed as approved by the committee, and a State wished to control entirely its own cities and its own approach to this problem, could it not have everything channeled through the State, if it desired to do so, by State law, and then the cities would act through the State agency, if the State so wished them to do?

Mr. McCARRAN. It could not channel the 35 percent allocation through, but it could—

Mr. BURTON. My point is that in the case of the 35 percent which is provided for the large airports—and the question there comes up as to a city applying for a part of the \$35,000,000 by matching it—is it not perfectly true under the committee bill that if a State wishes to require a city to proceed through its State agency the city must do so? The Federal Government is not controlling the State procedure. The State therefore can compel local procedure to be taken through a State agency if it wants to do so. The bill does not interfere with that at all, does it?

Mr. McCARRAN. What the Senator says is true, but what I have in mind is that this bill holds out 35 percent for city activities, and cities which desire to act on their own initiative ought not to be interfered with by the State.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The 35 percent is not simply for cities but for class 4 and 5 airports?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. And that fund can go through either the State agency or the city; can it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. Under the bill as it is before the Senate class 4 and 5 airports are reserved to the cities or to the urban program.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. May I ask the Senator a question on the point? If the so-called urban program—which does not necessarily relate to urban areas or cities, but simply to large airports—

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. If it is decided that that program shall go through the State, that can be done?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; or a county can build the airport.

Mr. BURTON. Yes. Therefore the point I want to make is that it seems to me that the Senator's bill, the committee bill, takes the position on the part of the Federal Government that the States can handle their matters any way they want to handle them. If they want to subject their cities to State control, then the Federal Government will deal with the State. If the States permit their cities to deal directly with us, then we should let the cities deal directly with us, and not compel them by Federal law to act through a special State agency.

Mr. McCARRAN. We cannot control the policy of the State within its own boundaries.

Mr. BURTON. But the difficulty with the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine is that it is in a way controlling that policy because it would prevent the cities from dealing directly with the Federal Government even though the cities and the States might wish that course to be followed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The honorable Senator suggested that the Brewster amendment, so called, would completely ruin the compromise embodied in the pending bill. The proposed amendment as I understand—and I believe it is a correct understanding—still leaves 35 percent of the Federal appropriation directly in the possession of or in the control of the Federal Administrator. The only thing that the State agency can do is to say, "We do not want that spent in the city of Detroit," to use the example which the honorable Senator used. It does not break down the compromise effected by the bill. It merely gives to the State agency the approval before the Federal Government can spend the money in the State. Am I not correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me read to the Senator what the Brewster amendment does. It is very interesting. On page 29 is the first place where the Brewster amendment touches the bill, and there

it destroys or strikes out all of subsection (e), which reads as follows:

(e) "Authorized project" means a project included in the national airport plan provided for in section 6 and, in the case of projects under the urban program, a project which has been selected and authorized as provided in subsection 7 (a).

The next place touched by the Brewster amendment is on page 31, under the caption "Sponsor." The following language would be stricken out:

(n) "Sponsor" means any non-Federal public agency which meets the requirements prescribed by the Administrator for sponsorship of a project under this act, and enters into a contract with the Federal Government, satisfactory to the Administrator, agreeing to operate and maintain the airport to be developed.

On page 32, lines 16 and 17, the Brewster amendment proposes to strike out "their political subdivisions, and other non-Federal public agencies."

On page 32, beginning in line 20, it is proposed to strike out the following language:

Such Federal-aid airport program shall consist of two parts, hereinafter referred to as the "State program" and the "urban program." The State program shall include all projects for the development of class 3 and smaller airports and the urban program all projects for the development of class 4 and larger airports. In each program, the State airport agency or project sponsor receiving a grant may use to match such grant any State.

On page 33, beginning with line 24, it is proposed to strike out the following:

Provided, That each such appropriation shall specify the maximum amount thereof that may be expended for the development of Class 4 and larger airports, in no event to exceed 35 percent of the total appropriation.

On page 35, beginning in line 20, it is proposed to strike out the entire section 7, under the heading "Selection of projects." That whole section was drafted after months of diligent study and great care in the selection of the language.

In section 8, on page 37, it is proposed to strike out the first part of the section, which reads as follows:

SEC. 8. (a) As soon as possible after the beginning of each fiscal year, all Federal funds available for the State program during that fiscal year shall be apportioned by the Administrator among the several States, one-half in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, and one-half in the proportion which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States. All sums so apportioned for a State shall be available to pay the United States pro rata share of the allowable project costs of authorized projects in that State, as provided in sections 9, 10, and 11.

On page 38, line 5, it is proposed to strike out the words "or public agencies therein", which destroys the text of the entire paragraph.

On page 38, in lines 9 and 10, it is proposed to strike out the words "and to public agencies", destroying the sense of the whole paragraph.

On page 38, beginning in line 16, it is proposed to strike out the following language: "and any public agency desiring to sponsor an authorized project in the

urban program, or an authorized project in the State program if located in a State in which no State airport agency exists."

That would destroy the text of the entire provision.

On page 40, in section 10, lines 1 and 24, it is proposed to strike out the words "or project sponsor"; and in line 15, it is proposed to strike out the words "or project sponsor as the case may be". That would practically destroy section 10.

On page 41, line 1, it is proposed to strike out the words "or project sponsor," which would destroy the sense of the entire paragraph.

On page 41, in lines 12 and 13, it is proposed to strike out "under either the State program or the urban program," destroying the sense of the entire section.

On page 42, lines 15 and 16, it is proposed to strike out "or project sponsor as the case may be," which would destroy the text.

On the same page, in lines 19 and 25, it is proposed to strike out the words "or project sponsor." The same is true on page 43, line 5.

I make mention of these items in the Brewster amendment because the Senate can see in a moment that if the Brewster amendment is adopted the bill must be entirely revamped. It is impossible here on the floor of the Senate to substitute appropriate language for the language which has been studied for months and inserted at the proper place in a section.

On page 45 the Brewster amendment proposes to strike out lines 18 to 21, inclusive, which read as follows:

(3) The State shall have adequate legislation to enable its political subdivisions to participate in the benefits of both the State program and the urban program, either by sponsoring projects therein or otherwise.

I could continue indefinitely to discuss the effect of the Brewster amendment. As I have previously stated, the bill is a compromise between the demand of the Governors' organization on the one hand, that all Federal funds be channeled through the State authority, and on the other hand, the philosophy of the mayors, who say that they wish to deal directly with the Federal Government. We had to compromise between the two viewpoints. At the time when some of the mayors appeared before the committee the bill provided only 25 percent for airport activities of cities. In other words, they could receive only 25 percent of the money appropriated. We compromised and made it 35 percent. We increased the amount so that the cities might come to the Federal Government and receive an allocation of 35 percent of the money appropriated by Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The bill nowhere defines an urban area. Under the definition of the Bureau of the Census in 1940, an urban area was described as an area having a population of 2,500 or more. Under the Federal Highway Act of 1944, an urban area was defined as an area with a population of more than 5,000. It is perfectly clear that if an urban area with a population of only

2,500 or 5,000, is to be a project sponsor, it cannot possibly support a class 4 airport project.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. Let me interrupt the Senator to say that that question is taken care of specifically in the bill, because a project sponsor is one who sponsors the construction of an airport; but the agency which enters into a contract with the Government for the maintenance and upkeep of the airport is another entity. In other words, unless the project sponsor shows to the Civil Aeronautics Authority that the sponsor is capable of maintaining the airport, it is the duty of the Administrator to refuse a grant of Federal funds.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. When we consider the question of a project sponsor which is larger than some of the small urban areas, we come to the question as to whether a new entity is to be created within the State, so as to permit the State aeronautical agency, together with the State engineering agencies, with all the State forces behind them, to assist in the development of the airport within the State. If a new corporate entity is to be created, it must be done by the State legislature, under paragraph 3 of section 14. Therefore the State must be brought into the picture in creating such a project sponsor. Why not use the State?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator has an example in his own State. I believe that the airport at Boston is a State airport. Is not that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. There is nothing to prevent the State from maintaining that airport. It belongs to the State. From the funds allocated to it by the Federal Government, the State may improve that airport or build another airport.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator called attention to Boston. In Massachusetts there are three airports built largely by Federal funds. There is one at Orange, which is uncompleted. There is one at Westfield, which is completed, and there is one at Beverly. The State legislature has been solicited to have the State government take over all those airports. The State has to take over the Boston airport because Boston was not in a financial position to sponsor it. Furthermore, there are approximately 20 town and cities within an area of 15 miles of Boston, and if this bill goes through in its present form many of those would be project sponsors and such airports would compete with the Boston airport which the State has had to take over. Therefore, the airports would have to be developed with the State's approval.

Mr. McCARRAN. I may not understand the Senator's point. I hope I do. But if the larger communities wish to build airports of their own, they should have a right to do so if they can sustain the airports. Suppose that under the conditions existing in Massachusetts the State wished to aid the smaller communities in building airports, the State could do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The State could do so, but would it be desirable for the State government to do so without the approval of the Federal Government?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Federal Government could deal directly with the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It might not, if the airport were a class 4 airport or an urban development.

Mr. McCARRAN. If it were an urban development it would have to be sustained by the community which built it; and if the Administrator were not convinced that could be done, it would be the duty of the Administrator not to make the grant.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct; but the bill under its present terms would permit the Federal Administrator to say, "The State airport is not a proper airport. We shall build a new one, with another sponsor, 20 miles away." Then the State would have nothing to say about it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Of course, the impossible is not expected to happen, and conditions of that kind are not supposed to happen. In other words, we are supposed to be dealing with reasonable conditions and reasonable men and reasonable administration. It is impossible to write a bill in which a flaw cannot be found in some way, a bill under which some peculiar thing could not be done.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But it would seem to me that some protection should be afforded. Otherwise, a comparatively small corporate entity within a State might find itself compelled to maintain an airport which was much too large for it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I believe and the committee believes that protection against that situation is afforded by the provision that they must guarantee the Federal Government that they will sustain and maintain the airport, before they receive the grant.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont, who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. AIKEN. I simply wished to ask the Senator if he can tell us how many cities have airport commissions or other commissions which are independent of other State agencies or commissions.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am advised that approximately 40 States by their laws now have set up separate commissions. Many of the States, like my own State, for instance, will work through their highway commissions or highway organizations.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the actual number is 44. Forty-four States have provided in some way for a State aeronautical authority or agency or, as the Senator has pointed out, some other agency.

Mr. AIKEN. Those agencies are independent of the public-service commissions or any other State commissions; are they?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is my understanding.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is so in some instances; I would not say it is so in all

cases. But I think my own State proposes to use the State highway commission, set up as an aviation commission.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me now?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. A few minutes ago under the questioning of the Senator from Ohio it was developed that cities could apply through the States for Federal aid. If a city should, of its own choice or under the policy of the State, apply through the State, the money it would receive would come out of the 65-percent fund, not the 35-percent fund; is that correct? The funds allocated to the cities under such circumstances would come out of the 65-percent fund, as set up under the bill; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. The funds now could come from either, because under the Ferguson amendment they could come out of the allocation of 65 percent or, if I caught the question correctly, the city could go directly to the Federal Government and could get its allocation from the 35 percent.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct. Suppose the city applied through the State. Then the allocation would come out of the 65 percent; would it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct, if the airport were a class 4 or class 5 airport.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I should like to make an observation in that connection. I understand that the Federal Government sets aside funds up to approximately \$35,000,000 for so-called urban airports, which really are not urban airports but are major airports, with runways of up to a mile or so in length, and I understand that \$65,000,000 is to be set aside for the smaller airports. The approach can be made, as I see it, either by the local governments or the State governments in connection with the allocation of the \$35,000,000 fund for the large airports. If a city wishes to match the Federal money for a large airport, it may do so, under the terms of the Senator's amendment and the committee amendment. But if under the law of a particular State—for instance, the State of Ohio or the State of West Virginia—the State were to say to particular cities, "We will require you to deal through the State," the State would then go to the Federal Government and would say to it, "It is a State matter, and we ask for our Federal money for the large airports through the State," and similarly the cities could ask for the money for the smaller airports.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a further question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then, as I understand the Senator's position, the division is really made upon the basis of the size of the airport, not on the basis of the method of application; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is made on the basis of the program.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If a city desired to have a class 4 airport—one of the larger ones—and if it made its applica-

tion through the State, the funds would come out of the 35 percent; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator assume that the city would make its application through the State?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; through the State, for a class 4 airport. The money would come from the 35 percent allocated for class 4 airports; would it?

Mr. McCARRAN. Under the Ferguson amendment it might come out of the 65 percent; it might come from either.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Under the Ferguson amendment might it not come from both?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS. If the city asked for an allocation out of the 35 percent and if the State wished to join, it could obtain funds from the 65 percent and could add them to the city's allocation under the 35 percent.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; that would be a joint participation as between the city and the State.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then, if the State policy required the city to act through the State in obtaining funds for an airport of any size, and if the city desired to have a class 4 or class 5 airport, if it went through the State and the application were made in the name of the State, but for the city alone, would the funds come from the 65 percent or the 35 percent, or both?

Mr. McCARRAN. If it were made by the city alone it would come from the 35 percent.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Even though made in the name of the State?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is another matter.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I understand that the last point is in line with the question I asked. Thirty-five percent of the \$100,000,000 is set aside by the Federal Government for major airports, so-called urban airports, class 4 and class 5 airports, and that \$35,000,000 is to be available for use under the major plan for larger airports. There will also be available \$65,000,000 primarily for the smaller airports. In answer to the Senator from West Virginia, let me say that, as I understand his question, if a city in West Virginia wished to have a large airport and if the law of West Virginia required, let us assume, that the city must proceed under State leadership and through a State agency, because the State wishes to control its cities through the State government, under those circumstances a city of West Virginia would go to the State of West Virginia and would say to it, "We wish to apply for a large airport." Then the State would make application to the Federal Government, and the Federal Government would say, "Under the plan, you need an airport at Charleston," or wherever it might be. You can match it with any public non-Federal funds you can raise. The city could therefore get its money for the large airport if it went to the State, and the

State could ask for a small airport if it went the other way.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In order to clarify the situation, let us stick to the major airport and not the small airport. The matter is handled through the State because of State policy requiring that the application be made through the State.

Mr. McCARRAN. First of all, it must be stated that the State is requiring every municipality within its borders to handle through it the matter of building an airport.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; and the application is for a major airport. It is presented in the name of the State because the State requires it to be presented in that form. When the State asks for a matching sum does it come out of the 35 percent or the 65 percent?

Mr. McCARRAN. It comes out of the 35 percent and out of the States' allocation of 65 percent.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, does the Senator know of any State in which it is necessary to go through the State agency in making an application for an airport?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no such knowledge.

Mr. LUCAS. All the questions of the Senator from West Virginia were based on the assumption that the State had taken over jurisdiction and that no city within the particular State could deal directly with the Federal Government. I do not know of any State having laws making it necessary to proceed through the State authority. I wondered if the Senator had evidence disclosing that such a situation exists.

Mr. McCARRAN. Not that I know of, but the theory is that at some time in the future some State might be in that category.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in section 9, line 13 on page 38, I believe it is stated who may make application so far as airports of class 4 or 5 are concerned. Section 9 reads in part as follows:

Any State airport agency representing a State which has complied with the provisions of this act and desires to avail itself of the benefits of the State program—

And I am uncertain what the State program would be with regard to airports of classes 1, 2, and 3—

and any public agency designed to sponsor an authorized project in the urban program, or an authorized project in the State program if located in a State in which no State airport agency exists—

And so forth. That would indicate that any public agency such as a municipality, a county, a school district, or the State itself, could be such a public agency, as I read the language, qualified to make an application.

Mr. McCARRAN. Allow me to go a little further and say that the State might create by law a new agency for that very purpose.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I read the provision, it would appear that everything can be done by the State, through its law, if it is so desired, that is being proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. Does not the Senator think that is true?

Mr. McCARRAN. I think that is true.

Mr. FERGUSON. And it is provided in section 9 that any municipality, whether it be a city or not, may make application to build even one of the larger airports.

Mr. BREWSTER. I quite appreciate the force of the logic of the Senator from Michigan. I am sure he is not so naive as to suggest that we are not all aware of the fact that cities are merely the children of the State, and that no city in this country may do anything whatever without legislative authority of the State. That is obvious. I think, furthermore, the Senator is not so naive as to believe that we do not realize that one of the great problems of the country is the maladministration of our great cities, and the bankruptcy of some of them as a result of their misadventures. Whether or not we are going to embark upon a program of city-States, such as threatens in some aspects of the program under consideration, I do not know. But the suggestion that the State government may be powerful enough to break a city lobby, and that the State may restrict the city in its exercise of its present powers under existing law by affirmative legislation, in the face of the bait that we as a Federal authority are here offering, is to me somewhat dubious. We know so well the consequences which have frequently resulted.

I am not revolutionary in my suggestion that we should adopt the long-settled principle of "Federal to State aid." I wish to discuss the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts. The fact is that the idea of State responsibility did not originate with me, or with the Council of State Governors, but was advanced by a well-recognized body, being none other than the Civil Aeronautics Administration itself under the responsibility of the law enacted by Congress in 1938. I believe that was the law which was sponsored by the Senator from Nevada. The legislation which created the Civil Aeronautics Administration also provided for a report on the airport situation, together with recommendations for future policy. I have in my hand a copy of the National Airport plan in which the Acting Secretary of Commerce reported on this matter and referred to the interim report filed on the legislation on February 1, 1939, and the final report of March 3, 1939, embraced in House Document 245. I read from the summary of the report a significant passage which I think answers fully the comments which the Senator has made as to whether we should have State responsibility involved in this matter, or whether we are introducing a novel doctrine.

The language to which I refer reads as follows:

Wherever possible, the guaranty of local contribution of expense should be obtained and the sponsorship assumed by a State.

I read further:

All applications for Federal airport grants from such a supplementary appropriation should be presented through agencies of State government.

I cite that language as showing that we are suggesting no revolutionary proposition.

Mr. McCARRAN. What is the date of the report?

Mr. BREWSTER. 1939.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is the report on the original bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes. It shows that at that time the Federal authority recognized this very sound principle to which we have referred. The amendment which is proposed by the Senator from Michigan, and the discussion here, have all looked in the direction of recognizing a primary State responsibility. The only question is whether the city-States in various sections of our country should be given further encouragement to cut loose from State control which, in my judgment, is the fundamental issue here before the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. Allow me to say in that respect that the report read by the Senator from Maine, which was made, I believe, by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, was dealing entirely with a different situation. The Civil Aeronautics Authority is behind this bill in its present form. It is interested in it. The bill was worked out by and with the accord and cooperation of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am quite aware of that point.

Mr. McCARRAN. The larger cities have been the sources from which large airports have risen. In other words, the cities of this country have in the past constructed these airports largely at their own expense. They are the ones which, to a large extent, have gone forward with aviation, so far as landing areas are concerned. There are exceptions.

Mr. BREWSTER. Was not that equally true before 1939? In other words, there has been very little city cooperation and construction of airports since the war period began. I think most of the great airports the Senator speaks of were constructed prior to the date of this report.

Mr. McCARRAN. I cannot say as to that. Let us take the LaGuardia Field. That came into existence after 1938. It has been completed only a few years. The Chicago landing area has been perfected only within the last few years. All the large airports have been constructed by the municipalities themselves, at their own expense. Then there are the smaller airports constructed by the Government itself. For instance, many airports were constructed where no municipality or State furnished any money at all. All they had to do was to furnish the land, and the Federal Government constructed the airport.

My attention is drawn to the statement on page 15 of a digest of the testimony on Senate bill 2, prepared by the Secretary of Commerce for Civil Aeronautics, who says:

There are only 316 airports of class 4 and above under Civil Aeronautics Administration's present airport plan and Civil Aeronautics Administration witnesses stated that they would have no difficulty in dealing on a direct basis with the individual cities, counties, or States which would sponsor these projects.

In other words, that was drawn to the attention of Mr. Burden and others at the time we were holding hearings, and

they then said they would have no objection and no difficulty in dealing with cities in the construction of the larger airports.

I shall now yield the floor to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SALTONSTALL rose.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall answer a question, if the Senator from Ohio will permit.

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There are two more points I should like to have cleared up. There are two provisions in the bill which have not been discussed which seem to me quite important from the standpoint of State government. The first point is that under the terms of the bill as it is now drawn a State will get no aid under the bill unless any taxes which it collects from aviation sources are used for aviation purposes alone. That is just putting one more whip on the States as to their revenue sources and what they shall do with them.

Mr. McCARRAN. We have had the same with reference to the highways. All moneys collected under the gasoline tax have to be used on the highways, and all moneys collected at an airport should be spent on the improvement and maintenance of the airport. That all goes to answer the question of the Senator from Maine, wherein he referred to cities which have gone bankrupt and have been unable to bear normal burdens. In other words, the income which comes to an airport should be applied to the upkeep and maintenance of the airport.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But the Highways Act, I believe, does not go quite so far as the Senator suggests, if my memory is correct. The State collects gasoline taxes and the Federal funds match those the State uses for highway purposes, but the State can use them for purposes which are not highway purposes, whereas under the pending bill if the State uses a penny for anything not collected with aviation, it will lose all.

Mr. McCARRAN. Money collected in the way of gasoline taxes in a State cannot be used for other than highway upkeep and maintenance.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is not the case in Massachusetts.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I believe the National Highways Act requires the application of gas taxes and other special use taxes only in those cases where a State is unable from any other source to match the Federal money. If they can match it from other sources, there is no requirement for using the gas taxes.

Mr. McCARRAN. That refers to matching the Federal money, but the gas tax and other highway taxes which are collected must be applied to the maintenance of the highways.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The question asked by the Senator from Massachusetts with respect to the control the Federal Government has over the funds going to the States raises a further question in my mind. What other controls does the

Federal Government maintain, if any, over the airports, once the States or the cities accept the grant provided for in the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall read the provision in that regard. I read from page 47 of the bill, section 15:

As a condition precedent to his approval of an airport project under this act, the Administrator shall assure himself to the extent feasible, that—

(1) the airport will be available for public use on fair and reasonable terms;

(2) the airport and all facilities thereon or connected therewith will be suitably operated and maintained, with due regard to climatic and flood conditions;

(3) the aerial approaches of the airport will be adequately cleared and protected by removing, lowering, relocating, marking, and lighting or otherwise mitigating existing airport hazards and by preventing the establishment or creation of future airport hazards so far as existing legislation permits;

(4) all the facilities of the airport developed with Federal aid and all those usable for the landing and take-off of aircraft will be available to the United States for unrestricted use by military and naval aircraft in common with other aircraft at all times without charge other than a charge sufficient to defray the cost of repairing damage done by such aircraft or, if the use by military and naval aircraft shall be substantial, a reasonable share, proportional to such use, of the cost of operating and maintaining the facilities so used;

(5) the airport operator or owner will furnish the Government at a reasonable rent therefor such space in airport buildings as may be reasonably adequate for use by the Government in connection with any airport air traffic control, or weather reporting, and communications activities pertinent thereto which the Government may wish to establish at the airport;

(6) all project accounts and records will be kept in accordance with a standard system of accounting prescribed by the Administrator;

(7) the airport operator or owner will submit to the Administrator such annual or special airport financial and operations reports as the Administrator may reasonably request; and

(8) the airport and all airport records will be available for inspection by any duly authorized agent of the Administrator upon reasonable request. To provide such assurance, the Administrator shall prescribe such project-sponsorship requirements as he may deem necessary, consistent with the terms of this act: *Provided*, That nothing contained in such regulations shall be construed to require any State or State airport agency to acquire any airport owned by any other public agency, to assume control over the operation of any such airport, or to sponsor a project which any other public agency is desirous of sponsoring. Among other steps to insure compliance with such requirements, the Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts with the States and other public agencies, on behalf of the United States, and such contracts shall be enforceable by decrees for specific performance.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for reading that section. It clears up a number of things in my mind. After the money is spent by the Federal Government on one of these projects, what further control, if any, does the Government have over the project?

Mr. McCARRAN. The provisions of the section I have read apply.

Mr. LUCAS. All the time?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; all the time.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. McCARRAN. I promised to yield to the Senator from Ohio some time ago.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator may proceed, but I have to catch a plane pretty soon.

Mr. BREWSTER. May I suggest a further quotation from Mr. Burden?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish to quote from Mr. Burden's testimony before the committee as it appears on page 330 of the hearings.

I wish to say, however, as I have said before, that the Civil Aeronautics Administration is prepared to administer the bill on either basis, either deal entirely through the States or through the States and cities, depending upon what Congress determines.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall now yield to the Senator from Ohio, because I have kept him on his feet a long time. I apologize to him.

Mr. BURTON. I am asking for the floor in my own right for the reason that I must leave with Admiral King in a few minutes to go to Cleveland to participate in an event he is attending there. But I should like to make some remarks on the bill and the amendment.

Mr. McMAHON. If the Senator will permit, I should like to make a brief observation relative to what the Senator from Illinois said. I call the attention of the Senator from Nevada to the fact that while it is true the bill does provide certain conditions which must be fulfilled by a State, there is nothing in the bill, though I think there should be something in it, which provides for conditions in regard to the airports which the Army and the Navy now have and which I understand they are prepared to turn back to the cities and to the States, after having spent on them millions upon millions of dollars of Federal funds. I understand that by the end of next week, at the latest, the Army and Navy will be prepared to turn back, that is, to declare surplus, six or seven hundred fields. There is nothing in the pending bill about that, and I therefore submit an amendment, which I shall call up later, which places certain safeguards on the return of such airports to cities and municipalities. It provides that the Federal Government, in time of emergency, may have the right to use those fields, on which we have spent millions of dollars. I do not know that there is anything in Senate bill 2 that would cover the already existing facilities.

Mr. McCARRAN. There is one provision in the bill which provides that the Administrator shall confer with the Army and the Navy as to fields which may be made available for public use. That is a general term.

Mr. McMAHON. I feel it is too general, because it does not sufficiently protect the Federal Government's rights in those fields after we turn them back, and I have submitted an amendment which I should like the Senator to look at, to cover what seems to me to be a very serious situation.

I thank the Senator from Ohio for his courtesy.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement in support of the bill as recommended and reported by the committee, and therefore in opposition to the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Maine. I believe it is necessary for us to understand the fundamental outlines and purposes of the bill in order to see the issue clearly.

First of all, I believe we should bear in mind that this is a bill to continue the development of aviation in America, particularly interstate aviation which has grown to such an extraordinary degree. The bill, as reported by the committee, carries forward the program which has been the source of that development, and I believe that the bill as it stands actually recognizes more fully the right of the States to do as they please within their own areas than does the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine.

I believe in protecting the States in their rights to do as they please within their respective areas and to align their subordinate organizations as they please, and I believe the Federal Government should not dictate to them how they should proceed and how they should channel their applications. We should make Federal assistance in developing the backbone of our whole air facilities available to whatever agencies are ready and able to match it.

To understand this issue, it is first necessary to understand what is meant by airports of classes 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. The simplest definition—

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Before the Senator leaves that point, he recognizes, does he not, that the option of most of the Governors and the Council of State Governors is contrary to the opinion which the Senator expresses out of his possible background as the mayor of a great city? Does the Senator concur in the view that they feel differently about it?

Mr. BURTON. I think I can make the reason for my position perfectly plain, and I shall do so in a few moments. I think that under the bill as reported by the committee the States as such have complete jurisdiction over their own areas, whereas under the Brewster amendment I think the State governments as such are told by the Federal Government to restrict their cities. The Federal Government has no business to tell the States how to handle their cities. The States can do that best for themselves, and we should be willing to deal with the cities directly if the State laws now permit it.

Referring to the general definition of the airports involved, it is somewhat confusing in the bill for the reason that airports involved in classes 1, 2, and 3 are referred to as State program airports, and those involved in classes 4 and 5 are referred to as urban airports. That is not the real distinction between the airports in those classes. Classes 1, 2, and 3 involve airports with runways extending up to 4,500 feet, and those of 4 and 5 with

runways exceeding 4,500 feet. Therefore, the real distinction, to my mind, is between the major airports and the minor airports, and, roughly speaking, the so-called urban program of major airports has to do with airports that have a runway of more than a mile in length, whether the airport be in a city, in a village, or in a part of a State where there is no municipal government at all. It is this major airport program that has been the foundation of our interstate air commerce through the years.

How shall the Federal Government proceed to administer that program? We are setting aside by this bill an authorization of as much as \$500,000,000 over a 5-year period—\$100,000,000 for the first year. That is to be divided in two clear-cut amounts. Thirty-five percent—the bill says “not to exceed 35 percent,” so it might be less than 35 percent—is allowed for the major airports. The urban program therefore may get \$35,000,000 of Federal money annually. That is, it is to be distributed among those airports regardless of State lines, but is to be distributed according to the national program. Under the committee bill Congress is to have the final say as to which ones it shall go. Under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine the matter comes directly under the Administrator of the national program, and Congress has nothing further to say as to which airports the money shall go. As a matter of fact, therefore, Congress retains a greater control over the distribution of the \$35,000,000 under the committee bill than under the Brewster amendment.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator has made a point that the Federal Government maintains control over the \$35,000,000.

Mr. BURTON. That is, the Congress has the right in the appropriation it makes and is expected to specify the ones to which the \$35,000,000 shall go, as recommended by the national program, but is not bound by the national program, and the money cannot be used until Congress authorizes it in each case.

Mr. McMAHON. But if that is the philosophy with regard to the 35 percent, why is it not provided in the bill that the 65 percent, or the \$65,000,000, should also be reviewed by the Congress? As I read the bill, the entire power is put in the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to draw up such plans as he desires without any review by the Congress for a period of 5 years. We commit ourselves for 5 years under this bill, which means \$325,000,000 from the Federal Government and \$325,000,000 from the States, or \$650,000,000, and neither the States, the cities, nor any one in the Federal Government, except the Administrator, have the right to project the plans for these airports. That is more power than I want to put in any single Government agency.

I should like to point out to the Senator how dangerous the situation might be if there should be adopted the kind of plan the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics proposes as the fifth revised plan.

I suggest that every Senator would do well to obtain a copy of that plan and consider the absurdities it contains.

As I pointed out yesterday, \$15,600 would be provided for an airport at a place called Antelope Island, which has a herd of moose and one family of five. That is typical of the absurdities which are contained in the plan which has been proposed by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics. The bill gives to the Administrator the right to draw up a plan without anybody gainsaying it for the period of 5 years.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. Before yielding to the Senator from West Virginia I should like to answer the statement just made by the Senator from Connecticut, because I am afraid it is not correct, and it ought not to be left standing as made.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wanted to ask the Senator about the particular airport of which the Senator from Connecticut spoke.

Mr. BURTON. I shall yield to the Senator from West Virginia in a moment. I want to make clear that there are certain limitations in regard to the preparing of the program set forth in the bill. But the vital thing is that the program respecting the major airports to which 35 percent, or \$35,000,000, is to be allotted, is a Federal program, and under the committee proposal that Federal program is not conclusive as to where the \$35,000,000 will go. The \$35,000,000 may not be adequate to cover what may be proposed, and therefore there should have to be some choice made between this or that airport. But in the committee bill now before the Senate it is provided that such allocations shall not be made unless authorized by Congress.

Under the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine the 35 percent is allocated in accordance with the national airport program.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not attack the provision of the bill respecting the 35 percent. I am pointing out the absolute lack of control over the 65 percent.

Mr. BURTON. Then, turning to the 65 percent—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I shall yield to the Senator from Nebraska in a moment, but I should like first to answer the question raised by the Senator from Connecticut. The 65 percent is to be expended in accordance with the plan, but the applications are of course to come from the sponsors, and in that case the sponsors are under their various State programs, and therefore the State itself will determine which of the many minor locations might be selected within the State, although it could not select one which did not come within the scope of the general plan, because Federal money is involved.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator see that they can sponsor, request, and apply until the cows come home, but under the bill as now written the Administrator can select sites for air-

ports anywhere he chooses, without any right of veto in either the Congress, the States, or the small cities?

Mr. BURTON. I think that is not quite accurate. For example, the State of Connecticut might have in mind a number of airports. The national board might look over the sites and decide that three or four of them came within the national program. Then an application would be made, but Connecticut could not obtain Federal money to assist in the construction of airports which did not come under the jurisdiction of the Federal board and meet with its approval. It could construct all the local airports it might desire to construct; but if it were to obtain Federal money, the projects must fit into the Federal program. However, the Federal board could not make the State build an airport where the State did not want to build it.

Mr. McMAHON. I am afraid that the Senator does not answer the objection that as the bill is now written the power lies in the Administrator either to accept or reject; and no one could do anything if he accepted or rejected a certain project.

Mr. BURTON. The Federal Administrator would list the projects with respect to which he was willing to make a grant of Federal money, and the State would choose the projects it wished to sponsor.

Mr. McMAHON. He could reject or accept any project, as he pleased, without any right of veto on the part of anyone.

Mr. BURTON. But the State would still have its quota of the \$65,000,000, and it would be found that the Administrator would be anxious to build any airport which came within the national program.

Mr. McMAHON. I prefer to have it distinctly provided in the bill that he shall not alone be the determining factor in the location of airports involving an expenditure of \$650,000,000, if we are to adopt the sum in the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. He is not the determining factor under the terms of the bill as it now stands, because he might select any number of airports, but if there were not a sponsor to guarantee the matching of Government money, dollar for dollar, and if there were no guaranty with respect to upkeep and maintenance, there would be no airports.

Mr. McMAHON. Even if the State should offer to sponsor an airport, the Administrator could accept or reject the project.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In connection with the answer given by the distinguished Senator from Ohio to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, that under the terms of the bill as it now stands the Administrator would not be able to locate airports throughout the country without the approval of Congress, let me say that at the proper time the Senator from

Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and I expect to offer an amendment to the Brewster amendment, inserting the language of section 7 (a) of the bill as it now stands.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. That language is not now in the Brewster amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. The amendment is at the desk, but it has not yet been offered, because it would not be in order at this time. If the distinguished Senator from Ohio will yield to me for the purpose of presenting the suggested amendment out of order, I shall be glad to do so at this time. It would cure the very difficulty which has been discussed, relative to whether or not the Congress shall authorize such projects, or whether it shall be left in the hands of the Administrator to locate class 4 and class 5 airports wherever he pleases.

Mr. BURTON. I have no objection to yielding in order that the amendment may be presented. However, I shall be compelled to leave the Chamber shortly in order to catch an airplane, and I should like to have the discussion of it postponed.

Mr. WHERRY. With that understanding, I should like to offer the amendment at this time.

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment submitted in behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and myself, and ask that it be read at this time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I believe that the point of order which the Senator from Nevada is about to make is well taken. If the Senator from Ohio will yield to me, I will accept the amendment as a part of my amendment. I believe that that will clear the point of order which the Senator from Nevada was quite properly about to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the amendment of Mr. BREWSTER, on page 3, line 1, after the word "as", it is proposed to strike out the remainder of the line and all of line 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

As hereinafter provided, at least 2 months prior to the close of each fiscal year, the Administrator shall submit to the Congress a request for authority to undertake during the next fiscal year those of the projects for the development of class 4 and larger airports, included in the then current revision of the national airport plan formulated by him under section 6 hereof, which, in his opinion, should be undertaken during that fiscal year, together with an estimate of the Federal funds required to pay the share of the United States under this act on account of such projects. In determining which projects to include in such a request, the Administrator shall consider, among other things, the relative aeronautical need for and urgency of the projects included in the plan and the likelihood of securing satisfactory sponsorship of such projects as required by him. In allocating and granting any funds that thereafter may be appropriated for the carrying out of such program during the next fiscal year, the Administrator shall con-

sider the appropriation as granting the authority requested unless a contrary intent shall have been manifested by the Congress, and no such allocations or grants shall be made unless so authorized.

(b) State program: After deducting from the amount of each appropriation available for grants the amount thereof that may be granted for projects in the urban program, the remainder shall be available for the development of class 3 and smaller airports under the State program, as proposed in the then current revision of the national airport plan. All such funds shall be apportioned as prescribed in section 8 and shall be granted for the carrying out of projects selected and approved for operation as provided in section 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the proposed modification of the amendment of the Senator from Maine accepted?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from Maine accepted the modification. Unless the Senator from Maine had accepted the modification, a point of order would have to be sustained.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is quite right. I thought I made it clear that I accepted the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is modified.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, the proposed amendment is accepted by the Senator from Maine. It has not been agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I do not understand that any amendment has been agreed to by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed modification of the amendment of the Senator from Maine has been accepted.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. The amendment was not agreed to by the Senate. It was accepted by the Senator from Maine. He agreed to accept the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska as a modification of his amendment. He can do that of his own accord. It is not the action of the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent would be required—

Mr. McCARRAN. Unanimous consent is not required.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendment is not related to the Brewster amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think it is a very essential part of the Brewster amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands, it is proposed to strike out—

Mr. McCARRAN. The amendment before the Senate is the Brewster amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. If the Senator from Maine wishes to modify his own amendment by accepting language suggested by some other Senator, he may do so; but that is not the action of the Senate. He has accepted the modification, and it is now, by his act, a part of his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not in order if there is objection.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a point of order—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If a point of order is made, it must go out.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator from Nevada object?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not object to the Senator from Maine accepting the modification, but that is not the action of the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. I quite agree with the Senator from Nevada in his parliamentary position.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada if he will withdraw his point of order, because we are all agreed, with the exception of the Chair, that the Senator from Maine can accept the amendment, and I should like very much to have it accepted.

Mr. McCARRAN. All the Senator has to do is to say "I accept it."

Mr. BREWSTER. I accept it.

Mr. WHERRY. I still would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee to withdraw his point of order, because the Chair has decided that we must have unanimous consent, and inasmuch as the only thing involved is the acceptance of the amendment by the Senator from Maine, I should like to have it accepted.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator from Maine give unanimous consent? [Laughter.]

Mr. BREWSTER. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada object?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; I do not object.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, as I understand, the question before the Senate is now on agreeing to the Brewster amendment, as modified, to the pending committee amendment. Is there any question about that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not understand that to be so, because the Brewster amendment, which is the pending amendment, proposes to strike out lines 4 to 8, inclusive, on page 29.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Chair has the wrong page in mind, if I am correct about this matter. I think it comes under 7 (a). That was the provision which was affected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is my amendment. I am offering the amendment to the language at the top of page 3, following the word "as", in order to fit it in as a new section, to be 7 (b).

Mr. BREWSTER. It is offered to the Brewster amendment; is it not?

Mr. WHERRY. It is offered to the Brewster amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not offered to the pending amendment, so it is not in order at this time. When that point is reached it will be in order.

Mr. BREWSTER. We are now considering the amendments en bloc, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the motion before the Senate was that they be taken up in order. The first one was

on page 29, to strike out lines 4 to 8 inclusive.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator from Nevada and I, at any rate, are agreed that no decision had been made on that matter, and in fact he indicated to me earlier in the day that he wished to consider the amendments en bloc, with a single exception, to which I fully agreed.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. A suggestion was made that it might be desired to consider them seriatim, but no agreement to that effect was reached.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is afraid there is some misunderstanding.

Mr. BREWSTER. Let me clear up the matter by requesting that we consider the amendment en bloc, with the exception of the amendment dealing with the Federal condemnation provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the Senate will proceed under that arrangement.

Mr. BREWSTER. Then, that makes this amendment in order for consideration at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which has been read, as proposed in behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and myself.

Mr. McCARRAN. I rise to a point of order. The Senator from Maine can accept it, and he has accepted it. That settles the matter. It is a part of the Brewster amendment now.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am pleased to accept the amendment as a modification of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his own amendment, of course.

Mr. BREWSTER. I so modify my amendment by the Wherry amendment.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, returning to consideration of the Brewster amendments en bloc, as modified, the fundamental issue here, after considering the allocation of the funds and the terminology used for airports, is how shall the \$35,000,000 for the major airports be sponsored by those who wish to participate in that program and how shall the \$65,000,000 for minor airports be sponsored by those who wish to participate in that program. We have in the past developed our great airport system through the States and cities, whichever were willing and ready to proceed. On that basis we have made substantial progress.

It is the purpose of this bill to continue that progress, not to put handicaps in its way. As I understand, the bill as originally proposed contained provision for a division as between the smaller airports and the larger ones, by leaving only class 1 and class 2 airports to purely State control insofar as sponsorship is concerned, and by placing class 3, class 4, and class 5 airports wide open to sponsorship by States or subdivisions thereof. Therefore the original bill, in order to continue the program sponsored by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, recom-

mended that the smaller airports—those in classes 1 and 2—be under State control, and that airports of classes 3, 4, and 5 be wide open for State or local control or sponsorship. Throughout the hearings it was developed that the States had been more active than in the past, and there was request that there be further allocation of funds for airports under State control. As a result of that testimony, the committee voted that airports in classes 1, 2, and 3—that is, those with runways up to 4,500 feet in length—should come under the sponsorship of the State agencies, but that airports of major character, namely, those with runways 4,500 feet or more in length—practically a mile or more in length—should still remain open for sponsorship by States or municipalities or any other public agencies which might have the initiative and the funds and might be ready to go ahead in conjunction with the Federal Government.

The point I wish to make particularly is that in the case of the major airports there is no prohibition against having a State sponsor such an airport, and there is no requirement that municipalities and counties in a State shall proceed only through the State. Therefore, under the committee bill, the Federal Government will leave to the State the entire choice regarding how it shall proceed in sponsoring the airports within the State, whereas the amendment is an intrusion upon rather than a freeing of the States from Federal control. To my mind, the amendment says, "In the case of major airports you shall proceed only through the State channels," whereas the States can require that now; but under the amendment the State would not be able to do anything except that. It would not be able to permit the municipalities to proceed as they wish and to provide the money. One hundred million dollars has gone into municipal airports so far. Many States, such as the State of Ohio, have no statutory authority to issue bonds. The cities are anxious to be able to continue as they have. I have before me telegrams from the cities of Cleveland, Toledo, Youngstown, Akron, and Dayton asking that they be able to continue in this matter as heretofore. Therefore I ask for adoption of the committee's theory. That will leave the States free, if they choose to be free, to permit their municipalities to act as sponsors; but if the States wish to do it, they will be able to do it. If a State wishes to do it, let it do it, but not the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure the Senator will agree that a State is equally free under my amendment to accord the right which the State of Ohio so urgently wishes it may exercise. So whether the Federal Government makes the proposal to the States or to the cities, I am glad the Senator recognizes the theory of State sovereignty. But if the State de-

cides in any instance that it wishes to allow a city to act contrary to what the Senator from Ohio has stated, the State will be at full liberty to do so. It will be able to proceed through any agency and in any way it deems best, in cooperation with the Federal Administrator, so that the exercise of the city's power to borrow and cooperate will in no way be restricted by the amendment.

Mr. BURTON. The practical answer to that is that at the present time the situation is such that the States have in large measure hung back in the development of the major airports of the Nation. We now have a situation in which the cities and local governments have taken the initiative and are ready to proceed. Therefore, if the Federal Government merely recognizes the facts as they are, we should pass a bill of this kind and deal with the cities or States as they are, rather than legislate something new into the situation and thereby require the States to proceed by a new method of dealing with their cities in some manner that will hamper continuation of the development which thus far has been obtained.

I believe the best way to make use of the funds of the cities, which are merely parts of the States and are controlled by State law—and their financial policies are controlled by State law—is to permit them to participate in State activities of this sort. If we do that we promote the aviation business and we keep out outside interests.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator will agree that while in many instances the cities have proceeded—particularly the Senator's own city of Cleveland—it is also true that in the past few years the States have rapidly recognized the situation and 44 agencies have been created to deal with this very matter. Therefore, I think it is unfortunate that the Federal Government should attempt to bypass the States. At that point it seems to me most unfortunate that the Federal Government should now bypass the States.

Mr. BURTON. The point is that the Federal Government is not bypassing the States. It is making its funds available to whoever is ready to use them under the State laws as they stand.

Mr. BURTON subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago, when I was addressing the Senate on the pending bill, I referred to telegrams I had received some time ago from the cities of Cleveland, Toledo, Youngstown, Akron, and Dayton, stating the position they are taking.

I wish to make the record complete. I did not at that time have before me the telegrams which I now hold in my hand, but my colleague the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] just handed me telegrams from the Governor of Ohio and the acting director of aeronautics of Ohio, taking the opposite position. I do not believe they understand the bill. [Laughter.] I ask that the telegrams be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, September 8, 1945.

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT,

United States Senator:

Believe that S. 2 ought to be amended so as to provide that the Federal Government will work through State governments in the development of a national system of airports the pattern applicable to highway improvements has worked out successfully it would be a mistake to have the Federal Government work directly with each of the local agencies.

GOV. FRANK J. LAUSCHIE.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, September 10, 1945.

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT,

United States Senator:

Understand S. 2, bill to provide national system of airports and to deal directly with hundreds of locals with reference to States, coming up on floor of Senate today. Wish to go on record as favoring bill with proviso that State participation is assured as provided by Brewster amendment.

G. A. STONE,
Acting Director.

Mr. SALTONSTALL rose.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator from Massachusetts wish the floor? If he does, I shall not speak at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. President, I hope that the Brewster amendment will be adopted because I believe it will make more practical the means for greater aviation activities, and provide them more quickly. The amendment merely channels the funds through the State without giving the localities the opportunity of going directly to the Federal Government without first consulting with the State authority. At least, that is true in case of the 35-percent Federal grant. I believe that one State enacted a law at the last session of its legislature which would require all funds to pass through the State aeronautical commission. I am not quite certain with respect to that, but I believe I have stated the situation correctly.

The measure under consideration does not provide how the engineering shall be done. Under the Hayden-Cartwright law, which is a law concerning Federal aid to State highways, the work is done directly through the public works departments of the various States. The pending bill deals with projects authorized and developed, but does not contain anywhere, so far as I can see, a statement with regard to who is to do the engineering. If the engineering is to be done by the Federal Government it will mean the building up of another Federal agency when the work can now be done through State agencies.

The amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] coordinates within the State all airport activities. It continues the present method of distributing Federal funds to the State. So far as I know, the only funds of the Federal Government which were distributed directly to municipalities in the past were the WPA funds. I believe that all child welfare funds, social security funds, public-highway funds, and funds of similar character were always distributed through State agencies. The pending measure provides for a new method of distributing Federal funds. On the

other hand, the Brewster amendment does not prevent the Federal Administrator coordinating into one city all the Federal funds which are available in any one year for the construction of a major airport.

Mr. McCARRAN. If the Senator will allow me to interrupt him, I respectfully invite his attention to section 12 on page 42 of the bill providing for engineering facilities. I did not wish to interrupt the Senator, but I thought that he might like to have that reference brought to his attention while he was on his feet.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The section to which the Senator refers reads in part, "in accordance with its laws, and under the direct supervision of the State airport agency or project sponsor as the case may be," and so forth. But there will be comparatively few cities, certainly few of the smaller cities, and certainly few of the project sponsors, which will have engineering facilities of their own, and they will have to turn to the State facilities or the Federal Government facilities.

It seems to me that the important point for us to consider and remember in connection with the Brewster amendment is that it does not prevent the Federal Administrator from going ahead with the national airport plan for larger airports. Under the Brewster amendment the Administrator will still have power to direct the \$35,000,000, or 35 percent of \$100,000,000, into any one airport, or any two airports in any one year. The only thing that the Brewster amendment does is to say that it cannot be done by the Federal Administrator without having the approval of the State aeronautical commission. If the State aeronautical commission approves, it can be done. If the State aeronautical commission does not approve, the Federal Administrator may put all that money into some other city in some other State. It seems to me that that is very important for us to remember. The program would be continued as has been suggested, and in a more effective way.

There is one provision to which I referred briefly in my discussion with the distinguished Senator from Nevada. I believe that the committee report goes further in compelling the States to use their taxes in specific ways than does the law concerning the building of highways. I know that in my State of Massachusetts we matched certain funds from gasoline taxes with Federal funds. But certain receipts from gasoline taxes were not spent for highway purposes. This bill states in substance that unless all the money which is received as revenue from aviation sources goes into aviation, then the State will receive no money under the terms of the bill. That seems to me to be one step further in compelling a State to take certain action which may not be desirable in a particular section of the country.

The Brewster amendment also eliminates the right of the Federal Government to compel the State to live up to its agreement by forcing it into the courts. I am not familiar with the provisions of the Hayden-Cartwright law in that connection, but I believe it is going pretty far to allow the Federal Government to

have the right to force a State into the courts. It can always stop its appropriation, but to compel the State through court procedure to perform a certain act seems to me to be going very far.

Whether we agree to that part of the Brewster amendment which eliminates condemnation of land by the Federal Government, seems to me to be relatively unimportant. The need is to build the airport. The airport should be built in the most practical manner. Perhaps it can be built in a more practical way if the Federal Government is given the right to condemn the land on which the airport is to be built. In some localities it may be necessary to condemn land outside the corporate entity of a city. Just what Government agency would do that if the Federal Government did not do it, I am unable to say. I do not believe that part of the Brewster amendment is of very great importance. However, I feel at this time, when we are entering the postwar era, during which the Federal Government will be asked to do many things in connection with State governments, and when cooperation between them will be needed more than ever before, that we should do our work through and with the approval of the State authorities instead of by-passing the State authorities and dealing directly with municipalities or project sponsors which will be new corporate entities within the State, and which the State government will have to create through legislative action. Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] to the committee amendment will be adopted.

CRITICISM OF ADMINISTRATION RECONVERSION POLICIES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it is becoming increasingly evident that a number of practices of the administration are proving inimical to the rapid and successful reconversion of our country.

I should like to call attention to four of the harmful practices:

First, Demobilization: It is obvious that the armed forces are demobilizing more with promises than with actions. This matter is, of course, primarily within the jurisdiction of our Commander in Chief and his military officials. Nevertheless, it has become an intense congressional concern in view of the fact that hundreds of thousands of anxious wives, parents, sweethearts, and servicemen themselves, have written to express their righteous indignation that the armed forces are proving longer on pious intentions than on fulfillment of those intentions.

I note that the President has just nominated 6 brigadier generals to the temporary rank of major general, and 17 colonels to the temporary rank of brigadier general. I do not question the right of our military officials to determine which men are entitled to commendation and promotion, but I do question very seriously whether the Army thinks that is expanding rather than contracting and whether it is paying attention to the fact that it is adding to the crushing overhead costs of the Federal Government.

Second. Federal 5-day week: A second harmful activity is that of the Federal Government in slamming its doors in the face of the public on Friday evening and telling the public to twiddle its thumbs over the week-end in spite of any urgent problem that may come up.

The skeleton forces which some departments say they leave on Saturday to transact emergency business are not forces, they are farces.

I am certain that every one of my Senatorial colleagues has had the experience of receiving urgent requests from his constituents on Saturday and being absolutely unable to get any action from the skeleton "farces," of the Federal bureaus, when, as, and if those "farces" are purportedly at work.

No one begrudges the Federal worker his week-end rest. But surely a system could be established whereby Federal workers could work one Saturday during a given period in return for compensatory time off during the week. This means having a solid working force on hand every Saturday to transact Government business.

Speed is of the essence in servicing industry, labor, agriculture, and our returning veterans in the reconversion period.

The situation is outrageous that Federal agencies like OPA and WPB should tie our people up in knots through arbitrary regulations and then blithely close up shop Friday evening, thus denying our people the opportunity to straighten out knots over the week end.

Third. Federal 30-hour week: There is talk now of a 5-day 30-hour week of Federal workers.

Enactment of such a workweek would be an insult to every taxpayer since it would add \$2,000,000,000 annually to the already crushing Federal tax burden.

It would be an insult to every farmer and farm laborer who have been and are continuing to work a minimum of 10 hours a day, 7 days a week in exhausting duties.

Such a workweek would encourage the cry for similar weeks in private industry. Thus, this proposed measure would be an insult to every businessman in the country who is trying to secure a peak output of goods in order to meet the huge backlog of consumer and industrial demands. It would be also an insult to every consumer whose need for goods would go unsatisfied for needlessly longer periods.

While the danger of inflation is still so pressing, everything must be done to encourage the maximum output of goods in order to soak up the vast amount of liquid savings in the hands of our people.

The Government should be striving by its model example to reconvert our thinking along the lines of the traditional American virtues of humility and industry instead of encouraging self-overvaluation and indolence.

Fourth. Farm inductions: In some farm areas farm deferments are now being arbitrarily canceled. Even these few essential hands, who were formerly deferred, are now being reclassified and inducted.

If this atrocious policy continues, it will strike a body blow against the Amer-

ican farmers who have already been stripped down to a bare minimum of help.

During the war the administration blatantly ignored and violated the Tydings amendment by inducting necessary and unreplaceable farm help. Does the administration propose to continue violating the letter and spirit of the Tydings amendment now that the war is over?

I have already written to General Hershey protesting the continuation of this policy. The text of the letter follows:

DEAR GENERAL HERSHEY: I am informed that back in my State farm labor which had formerly been deferred is now being reclassified into I-A.

A friend of mine who is running a dairy says that three of his milkers have just been so reclassified. I am interested in knowing what causes this change of policy on the part of the draft boards regarding the deferments of essential farm labor.

Can it be that the draft boards believe that unskilled returned veterans and unemployed industrial men can replace the deferred farm help? The fact is, for example, according to this letter, "that not one returned veteran has applied for a farm job in these parts and neighbors with houses to put families in have advertised for farm help without receiving a single answer."

I am further informed that the loss of more men will put many dairy farms out of business. As you know, farmers everywhere have been getting along with the very minimum of labor, and now is no time, after the magnificent job that they have done, to sabotage their readjustment to peacetime markets. Farmers have been working man-killing hours and simply cannot stand to be deprived of the essential hands who have helped them to keep the Nation's bread basket filled. That basket still needs to be kept filled and every available skilled hand will, therefore, be needed on the farms in the coming period.

I hope, general, that some definite action will be taken to put an immediate halt to the intolerable reclassification actions of which I write, lest further serious injury be inflicted on the food production of America.

REMOVAL OF RATION POINTS ON CHEESE

To offset this, Mr. President, I was just called to the telephone and informed that OPA has taken the ration points off cheese. It looks as if happy days will soon be here again, and I hope it will be my privilege ere long to see that my fellow Senators will be privileged to sink their teeth into some vitamin rich, luscious, aromatic Wisconsin cheese, let it be Cheddar or Swiss or Blue, brick, or other brands produced by that great State.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. Certainly.

Mr. TOBEY. Is that a threat, or a promise?

Mr. WILEY. I never make threats to a fellow Republican. Once in a while I may threaten when I am talking to a New Deal Democrat, but not when I speak of cheese, that is too pleasant a subject.

It is the stuff, sir, which you, of New Hampshire, need to nourish that fine working brain of yours and to put a little added vitamin into your blood corpuscles.

THE SUPPLY OF MEAT AND THE LIFTING OF MEAT RATIONING

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on September 8 the Office of Price Administration issued an order which terminated the order made some months ago relative to quotas on the slaughtering of cattle. This order is set out in detail in a release issued by the Office of War Information on September 8, 1945. I think it is only fair to the Office of Price Administration to have the entire order printed in the RECORD. It gives the reason why the Office of Price Administration placed controls on the slaughtering of livestock and the shipment of meat, and the reason why it removed the controls. I ask unanimous consent that the release may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Administrator Chester Bowles of the Office of Price Administration announced today that OPA controls over how much livestock can be slaughtered and where the meat is shipped ended at 12:01 a. m., September 8, 1945. The action was taken on the recommendation of Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson. Meat rationing is not affected by the action.

When the slaughter control program was put into effect last April, lower meat production, compared with last year, and continued high military requirements had resulted in a serious distribution problem, OPA explained.

The slaughter-control program was designed to increase the amount of livestock slaughtered in federally inspected plants by decreasing the amount of slaughter in non-federally inspected plants, from which meat cannot be shipped across State lines. In this manner, the requirements of the armed forces and other Government needs could better be protected. At the same time, a larger proportion of meat for civilians would be made available for shipment across State lines.

The objectives of the slaughter-control program were accomplished by imposing quotas on the number of animals non-federally inspected slaughterers and farm slaughterers (for sale) could process. Another major provision of the program called upon slaughterers to follow the same geographic distribution pattern in making shipments that they used during the first quarter of 1944.

"The decision to suspend these slaughter and distribution controls was reached after the matter was discussed with representatives of the Department of Agriculture," Mr. Bowles said. "They are in complete agreement with OPA that these controls should be dropped."

"Termination of the distribution and slaughter-control program is possible because reports of the Department of Agriculture indicate that present supplies of livestock are sufficient to assure good distribution under rationing without the use of quotas."

"The end of the slaughter-control and fair distribution program will have no immediate effect on meat rationing," Mr. Bowles said. "While there has been marked improvement in the supply of meat available to civilians in the last few months, particularly since fighting stopped, the supply is not yet sufficient to assure good distribution without the help of rationing controls."

Major factors that resulted in the decision to suspend the slaughter control and fair distribution programs were:

1. Department of Agriculture reports show there has been a large increase in

cattle receipts at terminal markets during the last few weeks and indications are the upward trend will continue.

2. Government meat requirements have sharply decreased. "Together, these two developments have resulted in more meat being available for civilians," Mr. Bowles said. "Now that the period of acute scarcity has been passed and with increased numbers of livestock being sold, we want to be sure there are no obstacles to prevent the slaughter of every animal that is marketed."

"Controls on slaughter and distribution were imposed as an emergency measure to correct bad distribution. Getting the program started on short notice involved a tremendous burden and called for great effort on the part of those responsible for the task. They did their work well. Without the control program, the meat situation would have been much more trying for most of us. As it turned out, within a relatively short time after the controls were introduced, it was much easier for housewives and others to get more meat than they did before."

Little more than a month after the program was begun—by the middle of June—reports received from OPA field offices indicated a slight but definite improvement of distribution in shortage areas. Late in July, when point values were established for the August rationing period, distribution of meat had improved so that it was possible to reduce point values of nearly all cuts of beef, lamb, and veal by one or two points a pound. Sharp reductions in point values were possible for the September rationing period.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an Associated Press dispatch and a United Press dispatch dealing with meat rationing, and two articles, one written by Malcolm Lamborne, Jr., of the Washington Evening Star, and the other by Helene C. Monberg, of the Washington Times-Herald, in which they predict the end of meat rationing as of October 1, 1945, as well as three news items dealing with the same subject.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of September 11, 1945]

BUTCHERS IN NEW YORK HAVE PLENTY OF MEAT BUT PATRONS ARE LACKING IN RED POINTS

Some officials reported yesterday that an end of meat rationing is "possible" by October 1, but OPA and the Agriculture Department said no definite date could be predicted.

In New York, however, a food dealers' spokesman declared the meat supply had improved so much in recent weeks that the commodity "could be taken off rationing entirely."

E. F. Guckenberger, secretary of the New York State Retail Food Merchants Association, said many retailers in that area were sending meat back to wholesalers because consumers lacked enough red ration points to buy it.

In Chicago Mrs. Rose Marie Kiefer, secretary-manager of the National Association of Retail Grocers, said a week-end telegraphic survey of State and local affiliated associations in 45 States indicated a prompt termination of meat rationing was necessary.

She said complete figures on the survey would not be compiled until tomorrow, but that broad samplings were so strong the association had telegraphed the Office of Price Administration, the Department of Agriculture, and Congress asking an end to meat rationing.

The two Government agencies issued a joint statement denying what they described

as "rumors" of disagreement between them on the lifting of ration controls.

"The Department and OPA are in agreement that meat rationing should be ended as soon as supplies are adequate and distribution is sufficiently equitable to permit such action," said J. B. Hutson, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

"However, they are also in agreement that the present supply situation does not now make possible predictions of the time at which meat rationing can be ended."

Shoe rationing may end before November, if desires of some members of the shoe trade are followed, but neither OPA nor the War Production Board has yet fixed a likely date.

[From PM of September 11, 1945]

REPORT MEAT RATION TO END

WASHINGTON, September 11.—Reliable sources disclosed yesterday that meat rationing will end October 1 and that shoe rationing will be discontinued on the same date or shortly thereafter.

OPA Chief Chester Bowles and Acting Secretary of Agriculture J. B. Hutson quickly announced that, while they are agreed that meat rationing should end as soon as possible, it now is impossible to predict when the action will be taken.

The United Press was informed reliably, however, that the two agencies already have drafted plans to take meats off the ration list at the end of the month. According to the informant, Agriculture Secretary Clinton P. Anderson favored lifting the controls on September 1 but OPA held out for the October 1 date.

President Truman notified all war agencies on August 15 that as many controls as possible should be lifted within 60 days after the Japanese surrender. Rationing of processed foods, fuel oil, and gasoline already has been discontinued and OPA believes that, with the exception of sugar, fats, and oils, other rationing can be ended this year.

Rationing of sugar, fats, and oils is expected to continue into next year because of a serious shortage in these items. But there is a good supply of beef, lamb, mutton, and poultry on the market to offset a continuing shortage of pork.

Informed quarters said that shoes probably will be removed from the ration list sometime between October 15 and November 1—and possibly as early as October 1.

[From the Washington Evening Star of September 10, 1945]

GROCERS LAUNCH DRIVE TO END MEAT RATIONING—NATIONAL ASSOCIATION TELLS FOOD OFFICIALS SUPPLIES ARE AMPLE

(By Malcolm Lamborne, Jr.)

An intensive drive to bring about an immediate end of all meat rationing has been opened by the National Association of Retail Grocers, representing a large segment of the Nation's retail food industry, it was learned today, as reports persisted that meat rationing would be ended by October 1.

An OPA spokesman pointed out, meanwhile, that no date has been set by the OPA and the Agriculture Department for the termination of meat rationing.

Reports that meat rationing would end much sooner than anticipated followed an OPA action Saturday lifting all its controls over the amount of livestock that could be slaughtered and doing away with its distribution program controlling meat shipments.

WIRE PLEA TO BOWLES

The Grocers' Association has wired Price Administrator Bowles, Secretary of Agriculture Anderson, chairman of Senate and House Agriculture and Small Business Committees and two special food-study committees urging a prompt termination of rationing.

The association based its recommendation on a wire survey last Friday and Saturday of member organizations in 45 States.

The group claims there are ample supplies of meat, particularly in the light of better supplies of beef and chicken, but that wholesalers in some cities are finding retailers turning down shipments for lack of red points.

Meat waste likewise is claimed by the association which cites instances of spoilage above normal in Omaha and Chicago.

A check with the retail trade here showed no instances of spoilage or meat wholesalers' trucks being turned back by retailers for lack of ration currency. Beef and veal supplies were described as plentiful, however, the best, in fact, since last year. In this connection, one chain store began advertising beefsteaks today for the first time in many months.

SEE TREMENDOUS MARKETINGS

An official of the national retailers group predicted that by September 15 "we will have tremendous marketings of livestock, particularly of utility beef."

"All we want is to give retailers an opportunity to supply consumer appetites which are limited by red-point rationing," the official declared.

Secretary Anderson was quoted several weeks ago to the effect that meat supplies would improve sufficiently to justify an end of rationing early this fall, perhaps as soon as September. Mr. Bowles was opposed to such action so soon and proceeded to establish new and reduced point values for September.

Agriculture Department officials, in the meantime, report that the final decision on lifting of rationing will be determined by cattle marketings during the next 2 weeks. An extra large run of cattle could bring about a decision to halt rationing, they said.

Movement of cattle to market is some 4 weeks behind normal so far, according to the Department. This situation has been brought about above normal pasture conditions, encouraging a longer feeding of range cattle.

NEW YORK STORES REPORT OVERSUPPLY OF BEEF

NEW YORK, September 10.—The supply of beef in New York is so plentiful, according to a meat industry official, that many "retailers report sending it back to the wholesalers."

A. F. Guckenberger, secretary of the New York State Retail Food Merchants' Association, said yesterday the lack of red ration points was causing an oversupply of beef among many butchers.

"The situation has improved so much in the last couple of weeks," Mr. Guckenberger said, "that meat could be taken off rationing entirely."

[From the Washington Times-Herald of September 11, 1945]

MEAT RATION SLATED TO END ON OCTOBER 1—SHOES TO BE FREED ABOUT SAME TIME

(By Helene C. Monberg)

Reliable sources disclosed yesterday that meat rationing will end October 1 and that shoe rationing will be discontinued on the same date or shortly thereafter.

OPA Chief Bowles and Acting Secretary of Agriculture Hutson quickly announced that, while they are agreed that meat rationing should end as soon as possible, it now is impossible to predict when the action will be taken.

PLANS ARE DRAFTED

The United Press was informed reliably, however, that the two agencies already have drafted plans to take meat off the ration list at the end of the month. According to the informant, Agriculture Secretary Anderson favored lifting the controls on September 1 but OPA held out for the October 1 date.

More good news came from an Agriculture Department spokesman who said that all cheese soon will be ration free and that the

order may be issued "almost immediately." He said the 40 percent set-aside for Government purchase will be canceled since the Army has cut back drastically on its requirements and has large supplies on hand.

SUGAR STILL SHORT

President Truman notified all war agencies on August 15 that as many controls as possible should be lifted within 60 days after the Japanese surrender. Rationing of processed foods, fuel oil, and gasoline already has been discontinued and OPA believes that, with the exception of sugar, fats, and oils, other rationing can be ended this year.

Rationing of sugar, fats, and oils is expected to continue into next year because of a serious shortage in these items. But, there is a good supply of beef, lamb, mutton, and poultry on the market to offset a continuing shortage of pork.

AGREED ON QUICK END

Hutson said that OPA and the Agriculture Department are agreed that meat rationing should be ended as soon as supplies are adequate and distribution is "sufficiently equitable to permit such action." He added, however, that they also are agreed that "the present supply system does not now make possible predictions of the time at which meat rationing can be ended."

Bowles described as ridiculous a report that he had asked Anderson to defer action from September 1 until October 1 so that termination of meat rationing could be timed with liquidation of OPA's field personnel.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce of September 11, 1945]

SEE MEAT RATION PROGRAM ENDING—POSSIBLE BY OCTOBER 1—ANDERSON PREDICTS END OF SUBSIDY IN 1946

WASHINGTON, September 10.—The end of all meat rationing by October 1 was seen as a possibility by some rationing officials today, although no date has been set.

Office of Price Administration officials said the decision would be made by agreement with the Agriculture Department but one Government spokesman said:

"If supplies look good by the end of the month, rationing will go."

OPA's action Saturday night removing all limits on the slaughter of livestock was taken in expectation of heavy runs of cattle to packinghouses. It was accepted generally as indicating a possible early end of rationing.

There is no dispute between Price Administrator Chester Bowles and Secretary of Agriculture Anderson on the desirability of dropping ration controls as soon as possible. An OPA spokesman declared that Bowles is "strong for decontrol."

Bowles has assured Congress that most rationing will end this year. Sugar and fats and oils, however, remained dubious. Bowles said continued scarcity of their supply made their release impossible to predict with accuracy.

Agricultural Department officials said the final decision on lifting of rationing October 1 will be determined by cattle marketings and demands for meat during the next 2 weeks. They said an exceptionally heavy market run of cattle could lead to an earlier ending of rationing.

SUBSIDY END PREDICTED

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., September 10.—Subsidies on cattle may be removed by April 1, 1946, Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, said today in addressing the New Mexico Cattle Growers Association.

The date, he said, will be set far enough in advance that feeders will know how to govern their purchases.

"I have been extremely hopeful that subsidies could be removed at a time when it would aid the producer without effecting the destruction of the cattle industry," he continued.

The Cabinet member assured the cattlemen that America would avoid the pitfalls that followed the last war and urged them to go about their tasks with the knowledge that the bottom won't drop out of things.

A food dealers' spokesman here declared that the meat supply had improved so much in recent weeks that the commodity could be taken off rationing entirely.

E. F. Guckenberger, secretary of the New York State Retail Food Merchants Association, said many retailers here were sending meat back to wholesalers because consumers lacked enough red ration points to buy it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I hope the action taken by the Office of Price Administration, as set forth in its news release, will become completely effective. With that in mind I took up with the Office of Price Administration the question whether they would remove the point requirements on meat, because it is my theory that inasmuch as the OPA has now done away with the meat quotas, which I think is a very fine thing, and in view of the fact that we are now having the seasonal heavy runs of cattle, cattle should be permitted to be sold and slaughtered and then marketed without any point restrictions. If that is done we will obtain the best distribution we possibly can obtain and I think we will also obtain the best prices we can possibly obtain, because it is my theory that production control to a great extent controls prices.

Mr. President, a memorandum addressed to me under date of September 11 directed to my attention the fact that Mr. Max McCullough had just confirmed this morning's report that no date has been set for lifting meat rationing; that Mr. Anderson and Mr. Bowles have not conferred yet on a lifting date, that is a date for lifting the points from meat, which has been predicted as October 1.

The memorandum further states in effect that OPA's action on Saturday night removing all limits on slaughter of livestock was taken in expectation of heavy runs of cattle to packing houses, and this move was generally thought to be a forewarning of the end of rationing.

The memorandum states further:

As you know, point values on meat were lowered over 20 percent as of September 1—and Mr. McCullough says they will be lowered again on October 1, but he can give no word on the end of meat rationing.

The reason being that the Office of Price Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture have not yet agreed on the date of October 1.

Mr. President, a step in the right direction was taken when quotas on slaughtering were removed, especially in view of the fact of the heavy runs that are now approaching at this season of the year. But the removal of the slaughtering quotas will not help the situation unless ration points are removed, because it is one thing to kill the animal, and it is another thing to permit the flow of the meat freely over the retail counters of this country.

I hope Members of the Senate will use their good offices with Mr. Bowles, for whom I have the highest regard, and with Mr. McCullough especially, and see if arrangement cannot be made for meat ration points to be taken off on October 1, and if possible, sooner, because the sooner meat points are removed the better will be the distribution and the more meat will flow into the homes of this country.

FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC AIRPORTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2) to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I will speak for only a moment. I think the discussion has made it very clear that the only purpose of my amendment is to determine the issue between the States and the city authorities, and the presentation made by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], which emphasized the rather comprehensive character of my amendment, I think he will agree, simply deals with the portions of the measure which could be calculated to create these distinct authorities in the city or some other agency.

With that statement I am quite ready for a vote at any time the Senator desires.

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gurney	Murdock
Andrews	Hart	Murray
Austin	Hatch	O'Daniel
Bailey	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bilbo	Hill	Revercomb
Brewster	Hoey	Robertson
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Buck	Kilgore	Smith
Burton	Knowland	Stewart
Byrd	La Follette	Taft
Capper	Lucas	Taylor
Carville	McCarran	Tobey
Chandler	McClellan	Tunnell
Cordon	McFarland	Vandenberg
Donnell	McKellar	Wagner
Downey	McMahon	Walsh
Ellender	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	White
Fulbright	Mead	Wiley
George	Millikin	Young
Gerry	Moore	
Guffey	Morse	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing en bloc to amendments, as modified, offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] to the committee amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say only a few words. Yesterday, in a colloquy between the Senator from Maine

and myself and others, I indicated my feeling that these amendments were unwise, notwithstanding the analogies which have been drawn between this program and the construction of highways and other cooperative activities between the Federal Government and the States. I feel that any local community, any city or county, which wishes on its own to inaugurate a program for the construction of airports ought to be allowed to deal directly with the Federal Government. Otherwise I believe that we shall run the risk of upsetting programs in many progressive communities which are able and willing to assume the responsibility of inaugurating these programs and carrying them out.

I shall not go into the question of power involved in giving to a State agency control over the expenditure of Federal funds. It is not necessary to go into that question. It seems to me that in connection with many of what might be called the urban sections of the country, the term "urban" does not necessarily mean building an airport in a city. The difference between class 1, class 2, and class 3 airports, and class 4 and class 5 airports, does not depend upon the size of the community. It depends upon the size of the airports.

Up to the present time many city councils, city administrations, and county administrations have taken the initiative in inaugurating the construction of airports to link up with interstate systems of air transportation. They ought to be permitted to deal directly with the aeronautical authorities of the Government of the United States. They ought not to be required to go through the State authorities.

For that reason, Mr. President, I feel compelled to vote against the amendments offered by the Senator from Maine. I believe that the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], which has been agreed to, whether it was offered as a compromise between the two theories or for any other reason, adequately deals with the problem, and leaves the great urban centers and the great independent agencies free to deal with the aeronautical authorities of the Federal Government, free from any repression, influence, or arbitrary determination on the part of State authorities as to whether or not they shall have airports.

For that reason I feel compelled to vote against the amendments offered by the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments, as modified, offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] to the committee amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode

Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to his State. I am advised that if present the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay" on this question.

I further announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. If present, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who would vote "yea" if present, and who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] are necessarily absent. Both of these Senators would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent because of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—40

Austin	Gerry	O'Daniel
Bailey	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hart	Reed
Brewster	Hawkes	Saltonstall
Briggs	Hayden	Smith
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Taft
Buck	Hoey	Tobey
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Walsh
Capper	Knowland	Wherry
Carville	La Follette	White
Chandler	McClellan	Wiley
Cordon	Millikin	Young
Donnell	Moore	
Fulbright	Morse	

NAYS—33

Alken	Hill	Murdock
Andrews	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Ball	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Lucas	Revercomb
Burton	McCarran	Robertson
Downey	McFarland	Russell
Ellender	McKellar	Stewart
Ferguson	McMahon	Taylor
George	Magnuson	Tunnell
Guffey	Maybank	Vandenberg
Hatch	Mead	Wagner

NOT VOTING—23

Bankhead	Glass	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Green	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Mitchell	Tydings
Capehart	Myers	Wheeler
Chavez	Overton	Willis
Connally	Pepper	Wilson
Eastland	Shipstead	

So Mr. BREWSTER's amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote just taken.

Mr. REED. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kansas to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 33 of the committee amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair requests the Senator to defer his amendment for a moment. Under the agreement there was another amendment, namely, on page 49, beginning with the word "Among", in line 5, to strike out down through and including line 8 on page 50 and to renumber the succeeding sections. The present occupant of the chair understands that while he was absent awhile ago it was agreed that that amendment should be next considered.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, is that the amendment dealing with the right of Federal condemnation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. BREWSTER. That matter has been rather fully discussed. I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that it is not of great consequence one way or the other, so I shall not request a record vote. I simply ask for a vote on the question whether to give the Federal Government the right of condemnation in connection with these airports.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not prevail, because this method of making sure that either the State or a municipal agency may have suitable ground on which to construct an airport has been worked out so that only on request of a State can the Federal Government proceed in condemnation. I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine to the committee amendment on page 49, in line 5.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished junior Senator from Maine whether his amendment proposes to take away or deny the power of the Federal Government to condemn.

Mr. BREWSTER. The bill as reported by the committee includes the power of condemnation for the Federal authority, on the request of the State or other local agency. My amendment would strike out that provision, so that such additional authority would not be cre-

ated. My amendment would leave the full power of condemnation with the States, where it now resides.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I recall, under the Federal-aid highway legislation, provision is made that the States shall furnish the rights-of-way.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Under that program the responsibility rests upon the States to procure the rights-of-way before Federal aid is available. I simply express my own view when I say that I think we should follow that same policy in connection with this legislation.

Mr. BREWSTER. I believe that is a sound principle.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Maine or the Senator from Nevada whether there is any provision in the bill as reported by the committee which would require a State to furnish the rights-of-way or the property upon which an airport would be constructed.

Mr. BREWSTER. The bill so provides.

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill makes that provision.

Mr. BARKLEY. It provides that the land must be furnished by either the State or the local authority; does it?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine to the committee amendment on page 49 in line 5. [Putting the question.]

The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. BREWSTER. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. I offer an amendment on page 33 of the bill, in line 16, after the word "first", to strike out "post-war"; after the words "year" and before the comma, to insert "following the enactment of this act"; and in line 17, after the word "successive", to strike out "post-war." The language would then read:

For the purpose of carrying out the Federal-aid airport program authorized by the act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$100,000,000 for the first fiscal year following the enactment of this act, and \$100,000,000 for each of the four successive fiscal years thereafter—

And so forth.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I always hesitate to disagree with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], particularly in connection with a matter on which he lays so much stress as he does with respect to the bill under consideration. I shall vote against the pending bill for two reasons: First, it represents an unsound policy. The aviation industry, carried on largely by private capital, is already heavily subsidized. It is a competing form of transportation. This bill would increase the subsidy already paid for carrying on one of the competing forms of public transportation. Mr. President, the Congress should not support such a measure. It is not fair; it

is not good policy, and it ought not to be done.

Secondly, sooner or later we must stop spending money in such amounts as \$500,000,000. The only thing that keeps this Nation from becoming known as a bankrupt nation is the confidence which our people and the peoples of the remainder of the world generally have that somehow we will pull through. There is no one who can blueprint any method or policy by which we can take care of our enormous public debt and keep our Government running even without trying to find some way by which to pay off the debt. In the name of Almighty God and sound public policy we should stop this spending, and the way to stop spending is to begin now. Following the Civil War a question arose as to whether specie payments should be resumed. Uncle John Sherman, the then Secretary of the Treasury, said, "The way to resume is to resume." He was correct. The way to stop spending money is to stop spending it except when the purpose of the spending is definitely necessary to the general public interest. The present proposal does not fall within that category.

An attempt has been made to compare the building of airports with the building of highways. No two things could be further apart than the program for building highways and a program for building airports. In the first place, it is true, as the Senator from Kentucky said yesterday, the Federal Government started its participation in highway building before it started collecting a tax on the sale of gasoline. But the fact is that in recent years the Federal Government has collected more money from the excise taxes imposed upon users of the highways than has been used for Federal aid in connection with highway systems. That is not true in connection with aviation. Here the beneficiaries pay nothing. All the people of the United States use the highways. An insignificant fraction of them uses aviation. There is every reason in the world why a national highway system is of vital necessity to the interests of the people generally in this country. That is not so in the case of aviation. As a matter of fact, aviation is being developed very largely—I am referring to aviation that is not military in character—by private companies for profit. They are making a profit. The Senator from Nevada, in preparing the bill, could have made the proposal a self-liquidating one. If he had done so I should be delighted to vote for it. If the proposed expenditure were to be paid back as the airports come into use, by the people who use them and make a profit from them, doubtless the proposal could be made self-liquidating.

So, Mr. President, while quite definitely in the minority, I want to make my record not only upon this bill, but upon every bill of a similar character which may come before the Senate while our National Treasury is bankrupt. I shall vote against such bills unless there can always be shown to be an urgent need for them in the general public interest. Fearing that there may not be a roll call upon the passage of the pending bill, I want to have the RECORD show my position with respect to it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move to strike out at the beginning of line 16, on page 33, "\$100,000,000" and insert "\$75,000,000", and at the end of line 16 to strike out "\$100,000,000" and insert "\$75,000,000." So far as I know the figure "\$100,000,000" was simply taken out of the air.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator have a copy of his amendment?

Mr. TAFT. I do not have a copy. My motion would simply strike out the "\$100,000,000" in each instance and substitute "\$75,000,000." The total expenditure would thereby be reduced from \$500,000,000 to \$375,000,000 for the 5 years.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. What is the necessity of providing \$75,000,000 for 5 years? Why not make it \$75,000,000 for 1 year, and then take another look at it the following year?

Mr. TAFT. I believe that if we are going to make a plan for public works it is wise to make it for a number of years in advance. I do not object to the 5-year period. Perhaps it is a little long, but I think that if we are going to encourage and develop a program for a system of airports—and I am in favor of doing so with some Federal assistance—it must be longer than for 1 year. I feel very strongly that we do not know what the Federal Budget is going to be, we do not know what the expenses of the Federal Government are going to be, we do not know what the taxes are going to be, and we do not know whether we are creating an additional deficit, or whether we will have money to spend. I feel that in connection with all these expenditures—and one bill after another calling for appropriations will be coming before the Senate—we should go about the matter very cautiously and very carefully. I believe that we should hold the figures down as much as we possibly can do so. I believe in the development of the air industry. The development of air transportation is one of the industries which we should encourage during the postwar period. I believe that a program along that line is justified, but I also feel that we should hold the expenditure to as reasonable a figure as possible. I could have provided in my amendment for \$50,000,000, but it seems to me that \$75,000,000 a year represents a substantial reduction and yet will meet the demands of the situation.

Mr. McMAHON. It seems to me that the Senator's remarks are sensible and well taken. However, I can see no good reason for providing that the expenditures be made over a period of years. I think we should provide for 1 year, and at the end of that period we could consider the matter further.

Mr. TAFT. I should be glad to have the Senator offer any amendment to my amendment he wishes to present, and I would not greatly object to supporting it, but I should like to make the statement, if I may, as to why I think there should be at least a reduction in the figure now provided by the bill.

In the first place, there is no Federal Budget today. I have here perhaps the best study that has been made by the Brookings Institution, and they show the estimates in three classes for 1949, which they consider the first postwar normal year. They estimate the minimum at \$18,800,000,000 for the Federal Budget, maximum of \$25,840,000,000, and a probable Federal Budget of \$22,000,000,000, without any of the increases which are now being proposed, and which the Senate will have to consider.

On the other hand, the tax results, so far as they have been estimated, seem to indicate that under the present tax system, if we go into the fiscal year 1947 with the present tremendously high taxes, we are likely to raise only about \$32,000,000,000 a year.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Finance, has proposed a reduction of taxes which amounts to five or six billion dollars a year, which will reduce the Federal revenue to approximately \$26,000,000,000. If we proceed as we are now going without any attempt to save, we will find that we cannot hope for any further reduction in taxes if we are to meet the expenses of the Federal Government, and that is without making any payment on the national debt.

I think the Senator from Georgia hopes, as I hope, that if we make a reduction of five or six billion dollars this year, we should be able to reduce the taxes that much more next year, or the second year, and that we will then have a system which will still represent a very high tax assessment, but I think it will not be one which we cannot hope to support and still have expansion in industry.

The spending proposals which are now before the Congress I have enumerated once or twice before, and they are very substantial. We have a bill proposing \$550,000,000 annually for aid to education.

We have a bill appropriating \$100,000,000 for aid in financing vocational education.

We have a national food allotment stamp plan involving \$500,000,000.

We have already passed a rural electrification measure calling for an expenditure of \$200,000,000.

We have a bill for a Rural Telephone Administration, \$50,000,000.

There is a bill to provide annual aid in the construction of hospitals, \$110,000,000.

There are proposals of various kinds for further aid to States in the health programs, amounting to \$600,000,000 a year.

There is a bill for school-lunch programs, proposing \$100,000,000 a year.

There is a bill to aid the States in eliminating river pollution, \$50,000,000 a year.

There is the bill for aid for aeronautical experiments, \$50,000,000.

There is provision for additional subsidies for public housing, about \$80,000,000.

We have proposals for aid to foreign governments, in the nature of loans, which may or may not be repaid. Evidently we are going to have at least

\$3,000,000,000 in requests from the British, in addition to all we have already provided under the Bretton Woods agreements, and the three and a half billion dollars we have provided for the Export-Import Bank.

We have various veterans' bills, the largest being one for a bonus of a thousand dollars, which will cost \$13,000,000,000.

There is a bill to increase Federal salaries by proposing a 30-hour week, which will cost probably \$500,000,000 a year.

The President has indicated his intention to submit an additional program for UNRRA costing \$1,350,000,000.

There is \$25,000,000 for the Inter-American Highway.

There is \$500,000,000 a year for veterans' hospitals.

There is \$500,000,000 more for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The total spending that has been proposed in Congress might easily run the Federal Budget up to \$50,000,000,000 a year, and, so far as I can see, no one can devise a system of taxation which is not too burdensome which will produce more than about \$25,000,000,000, and I think that would be very burdensome. Certainly, I hope we can hold the Budget fairly close to \$20,000,000,000 a year. There is a big difference between \$20,000,000,000 and \$25,000,000,000. If the Budget shall amount to \$25,000,000,000 a year, I think we will have such a burdensome system of taxation that it will actually choke enterprise and the production which will be necessary to produce the very taxes we are trying to obtain.

Therefore it seems to me that in connection with every project proposed, we should hold the program to as reasonable a figure as possible. I myself have in mind that we can provide for public works and the various social welfare plans which have been proposed by adding to all previous expenses perhaps a billion dollars, that is, in addition to the highway program of \$500,000,000 a year, which is the largest part of our public-works program. I hope we can hold to that, and I believe that if we are to do it, whenever any of these meritorious projects are presented—and many of them are meritorious—we should hold them to just as low a figure as possible.

The general feeling is that we have to put people to work. I would say that, so far as the public-works program for that purpose is concerned, we should plan it. I am very hopeful that conditions in private industry are going to be such, the demand is going to be so great—the backlog of demand is now very great—that as soon as we get over the period of reconversion, we shall have one of the most prosperous periods in our history, and we do not want to set up tremendous competition on the part of the Federal Government if we are to have such prosperity. I do not believe there is any justification, from that standpoint, in providing these permanent public-works programs, which are going to take a year to get going, and which will produce work and employment at the very time when it is unnecessary any longer to do so. We might

say the Nation is entirely shabby, and out of repair, and hundreds of millions of dollars can be spent on bringing the plant up to normal. I believe that is the only kind of work we can get going in the next 6 months, when we will face the only serious crisis of unemployment.

For these reasons I think when these measures are prepared, they should be prepared in the most reasonable amounts, and I hope very much that the Senate may see fit to provide in this bill \$75,000,000 a year, and at least show its intention of approaching these problems from an economical standpoint.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator think that a hundred million dollars, spent over 2 years, would meet his suggestion about the necessity for intelligent planning, and yet provide sufficient funds to inaugurate the program?

Mr. TAFT. I think so.

Mr. McMAHON. What I have in mind is that, apparently, there is no field in which technological progress has been so rapid, as in the field of aviation. Within 2 years these great airports, calling for landing strips from eight to ten thousand feet long, might be obsolete, due to the fact that the present planes, giant though they are, might be replaced by rocket-propelled and jet-propelled planes, which would require only short runways. So I think it is not wise to tie ourselves up to a 5-year plan, but I suggest \$100,000,000 for 2 years.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what would the Senator think of having a 3-year program of \$75,000,000 a year, as I propose, so as to inaugurate a fairly general plan? It will really take 2 or 3 years to complete many of these projects. I am glad to accept any reasonable amendment which is in accord with the will of the Senate, but I do not want to indicate any opposition to the whole project. I think it is generally a very worthy project.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not wish to be understood as being in opposition to the project. It seems to me that \$100,000,000 matched with another \$100,000,000 is about all that will be available for the first 2 years. I think the 2-year period is quite sufficient. Let the sponsors of the proposal come back to us at the expiration of that time, and we can then consider what to do.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, before the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] offered his amendment I had in mind to offer an amendment reducing the amount of the annual authorization to \$50,000,000 a year. I shall offer that amendment now as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President, I want it understood first that I favor the general objectives of the bill. I think we all recognize that there is going to be tremendous development in the field of aviation within the next few years. I do not think the Federal Government should hesitate to take part in promoting this program, but I agree with what the Senator from Ohio has said with respect to proposals for huge Federal expenditures. We ought to approach them with caution.

If there ever was a time in America when we ought to begin to think and act in terms of economy, now is the time. For that reason, Mr. President, I believe the amount proposed in the bill as well as the amount proposed by the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio are far too large and ambitious, and do not represent a cautious approach to the problem. Certainly after having proceeded with the program for a year or two, when we have gained experience, and have had opportunity for further observation and an opportunity to determine the real need, and the response that is being given to the proposal from the different communities throughout the United States, then if the program is not adequate and if the authorization is not adequate, it will be very easy for the Congress, when it recognizes that fact, to increase the authorization from time to time. But once we commit ourselves by the passage of the proposed legislation to an authorization of \$500,000,000 it will be accepted that we are going through with a program of that proportion.

Mr. President, in spite of all the anticipated development of aviation and the progress we anticipate it will make within the next few years, I seriously doubt that the country can absorb a program of this kind. If it does, there will be a \$1,000,000,000 airport construction program in the Nation within 5 years' time. During the war period, through the work of the Army and the Navy, and in the general national defense program and in the war effort, we have already constructed many airports throughout the Nation. We do not know what we are going to do with some of them today. I know of one very large airport constructed in my home State in connection with a testing ground for ammunition and explosives which is located in a comparatively small community. Even if the Government turned that airport over to the city free, the community is not large enough to maintain and support it. There are a number of such situations throughout the Nation. A number of airports have been built as well as training fields. I think before we launch upon such a tremendous and so ambitious a program as this we ought to reduce the amount and proceed with caution.

Frankly, Mr. President, if I were simply setting the figure in my own mind, I think it should even be less than \$50,000,000 a year, but I feel that we ought to have a program of this character. Others think the program ought to be on the basis of the figures contained in the bill as it was reported by the committee and as it is now before the Senate. I feel that \$50,000,000 a year for a period of 5 years will not only be adequate, but that it will meet the needs of the country, and certainly at this time, at the very beginning of the postwar era, with so many demands being made upon the Federal Government for more money and greater spending for this purpose and that purpose, the wise thing for the Congress to do is to approach the question in a cautious and conservative manner. Let us proceed at this time on the basis of \$50,000,000 a year until experience and

development indicates that that program ought to be enlarged and expanded.

Mr. President, I offer my amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the committee amendment, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the amendment proposed by Mr. TAFT on page 33, line 16, it is proposed to strike out \$75,000,000 and insert \$50,000,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is entitled to recognition. I should like to yield to him. He has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts has been on his feet longer than I have.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I wish to make an inquiry of the Senator from Vermont if he will permit me to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WALSH. The Navy Department has called my attention to certain principles it would like to have incorporated in this bill. I have conferred with the Senator from Nevada and he thinks they are already embodied in the bill, and I am inclined to agree with him, but I should like, for the sake of the record, that he make an affirmative statement.

The Navy Department requests that the following principles be incorporated in the bill:

(a) All airports developed or improved with Government funds should be available at all times on a limited basis for use by Government aircraft in common with others without charge.

(b) The Government should have the right to full and unrestricted possession and control of such airports during the period of any national emergency.

I understand the Senator has stated that though the language is not the same as that suggested by the Navy Department, these principles are within the scope of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I may say to the Senator that I drew the Senator's attention to the language of the bill and I am certain that the principles he calls attention to are adequately covered by the language of the bill.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I have listened attentively to the answer given by the Senator from Nevada to the question asked him by the Senator from Massachusetts. I cannot find in the bill any language which covers the postwar use of the surplus Army and Navy fields which the Army and Navy will shortly turn over to the Surplus Property Board. I find nothing in the bill to protect the Government's use in the national emergency of the hundreds and hundreds of fields involved. I would appreciate being referred by the Senator from Nevada to that portion of the bill which he thinks protects the Federal Government's right in the postwar use of these fields after they are turned back to the Surplus Property Board.

Mr. McCARRAN. Would the bill protect the Federal Government in the use of the fields after they are turned back? Is that the question?

Mr. McMAHON. That is the question. I understand that the Senator from Massachusetts is concerned about the right of the Government to use, during some future national emergency, fields which we have constructed at an expense of hundreds of millions of dollars. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that there may be such a provision in the bill, but I have not found it.

Mr. McCARRAN. That was not the question of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. The inquiry which I made was not in reference to airfields which become surplus property, but airfields which are operated, controlled, and developed as a result of the proposed legislation. The Navy Department has not called my attention to what control it should have, and what rights it should have over airfields which become surplus property.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator believe that that would be a very proper subject for treatment in this bill?

Mr. WALSH. I am inclined to agree with the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator from Connecticut that if an airport is turned over as surplus property to a municipality or State, it can be turned over with any conditions which may be imposed by the conveying agency. In other words, if the Navy has an airport which it considers surplus, and wishes to turn over to a State, it can turn it over with any condition it may impose as to return for future use.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me say to the Senator that there is no legislative guide or direction on the books, either in the Surplus Property Act or in this bill, setting forth the conditions under which cities and States shall use these airports, subject to use by the National Government.

Mr. McCARRAN. There is nothing which requires the Army or the Navy to turn over the airports, either.

Mr. McMAHON. I know that they are going to turn them over.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know that.

Mr. McMAHON. I happen to know it, and I think that situation should be taken care of.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator may know it, but the Congress does not know it.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator can learn the facts from the same source from which I learned them.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Connecticut has raised a very important question, and I should like to contribute this thought: Recognizing this situation, during August we called a conference in Maine with the Federal authorities concerned, including the highest representatives of both the Army and the Navy. We asked this specific question: Since we have five class 5 airports in Maine, built almost entirely by Federal funds, some of which airports the Government was preparing to abandon, we wanted to know what the situation was going to be.

I can say that the War and Navy Departments themselves are entirely unclear as to how the problem should be handled. I believe that it is a matter of the highest importance, on which there should be a declaration of Federal policy by the Congress. I hope the Senator from Connecticut will address himself to the question and perhaps propose an amendment or legislation dealing with the question. I can assure him that every State in the Union will face the same situation.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me say to the Senator from Maine that I now have an amendment on the desk, which I should like to call up for discussion, which would take care of this problem, if this is the proper time to take it up.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not yield for the consideration of an amendment at this time.

I hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and any other amendment which would cripple the airport expansion program of the United States will be defeated. At this time I believe that we should look ahead, and not backward. We should realize the situation in which the country finds itself at the present time. We must realize that we have a national debt of almost \$300,000,000,000. In order to take care of that debt and maintain the value of the bonds which the people of the country have bought, we must have a tremendous expansion of our national economy and business. We cannot have such an expansion unless we have a great expansion of our transportation systems of all kinds.

It has been said that no study has been given to this question, and that the amount of \$100,000,000 is purely arbitrary. As I understand, the Civil Aeronautics Administration has made a thorough study. It has determined upon the program which is necessary adequately to service the United States with airports.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. To emphasize what the Senator is saying, let me say that the Civil Aeronautics Administration set up a program of \$625,000,000 over a period of 10 years. We thought differently in the committee, and set up a program of \$100,000,000 for 5 years. The House is now working on a bill which carries a larger sum.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure that if this sum is not sufficient, it will be increased by the House or in conference.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment to take up a bill?

Mr. AIKEN. No; because I expect to take only a few minutes longer. If the Senator from Texas does not mind, I am sure that I shall take less time than he would take, because I am almost through with what I have to say. I do not wish to be discourteous, but I shall consume only a few minutes more, and I know that any bill which might be

taken up would consume more time than that.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to leave the Chamber to attend a meeting of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. AIKEN. The sum of \$100,000,000 has been determined upon by the committee, and I assume that the committee made a thorough study before it made its recommendation. This is no time for us to go along with those interests which advocate a policy of scarcity, because that will not suffice to keep our country on a sound basis in the future.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] stated that the expenditures on airports were all outgo, with no income. If I am correctly informed, Mr. President, approximately 25 years ago the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], who is now President pro tempore of the Senate, secured the inauguration of the air-mail system in the United States. At the time he promoted it he was subject to ridicule and was joked about because he saw a future in the air-mail system. However, during the past year the air-mail service of the United States made a profit of about \$25,000,000 for our Government, or 25 percent of the annual amount which is asked for an airport expansion program. It is entirely conceivable that if this airport expansion program were put through and the air-mail rates should remain as they are now the profit on the air-mail business alone would pay the entire cost of this construction program. I feel that the expenditure of \$100,000,000 would not be an expense to the United States, but would be a sound investment, which would yield very beneficial returns to our country. I hope that any amendment which would cripple the airport expansion program of the United States will be rejected.

I now yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not mean to interrupt the Senator again, but I thank him just the same.

Mr. AIKEN. I am practically through. APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICIALS AS REFEREES IN BANKRUPTCY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 1365. The bill has been unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1365) to amend section 35 of the Bankruptcy Act to permit the appointment of supervising conciliation commissioners as referees in bankruptcy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, under the present law commissioners appointed under the Lemke Farm Adjustment Act cannot be appointed as referees in bankruptcy. A person may not be appointed as a referee in bankruptcy

if he holds any office under the United States or any State, with the exception of certain specific offices. Notaries public and certain others are exempted. This bill would simply include among the exemptions supervising conciliation commissioners. A certain judge in my State wishes to appoint as a referee in bankruptcy a friend of mine who is an adjuster of the Farm Security Administration, and he cannot do so under the law. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is a member of the Judiciary Committee. He knows all about this subject. He has had some experience with it, and he strongly favors the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I heartily support the bill, and I hope that my colleagues will also support it.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, was the bill unanimously reported by the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. CONNALLY. The bill was unanimously reported favorably.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I did not hear all the remarks of the Senator from Texas; but is the proposed legislation inspired by a desire to take care of a specific situation in Texas?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; but the language is general.

Mr. TOBEY. Does the Senator believe that the general value is sufficient to justify the passage of the bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. It would apply to the Senator from New Hampshire as well as to anyone else.

Mr. TOBEY. With that understanding and interpretation, I will say "amen."

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator from New Hampshire can find time, amid his onerous duties, to be consulted, this bill will apply to him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That clause (2) of section 35 (relating to qualifications of referees) of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended (52 Stat. 857; U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 11, sec. 63), is amended to read as follows: "(2) not holding any office of profit or emolument under the laws of the United States or of any State other than commissioners of deeds, justices of the peace, masters in chancery, notaries public, or supervising conciliation commissioners."

FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC AIRPORTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2) to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, referring to the remarks of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I wish to suggest another reason why we should be economical in the matter of granting aid to cities. I read from the New York Times' account of the Idlewild airport

proposal. It says that the cost of the field and the central terminal building will be \$90,000,000, while an additional \$70,000,000 will be spent for hangars, shop facilities, and a 3-mile-long, two-story arcade enclosing the terminal area. I read from a further portion of the article:

The comptroller expressed the hope that the leases for airport space would be ready to sign in about 10 days, so that they could be presented to the board of estimate and advertised for a public hearing. The board will receive a report outlining the financial prospects of the airport. Mr. McGoldrick declared his complete confidence that the airport would be "a financially sound, self-supporting investment."

Under this bill, although New York will spend \$90,000,000 on this airport, we would put up \$45,000,000, and they would get their airport for almost nothing; on their \$45,000,000 investment they would get twice as much return as they were going to get on the \$90,000,000 investment.

So, by reason of the facts cited by the Senator from Vermont, namely, that air traffic is profitable and is increasing, it seems to me that many of these airports will be self-supporting. If the Federal Government makes a hand-out of half the money, the city or State will get the airport for next to nothing. Probably that is not true of many of the small airports, but certainly it is true of many of the large ones.

Furthermore, if the States get all the money from the Federal Government, they will build shops and concession buildings as large as they possibly can, and one-half the cost will be at the expense of the Federal Government, as I read the bill. So it seems to me there is room for economy in the dispensation of Federal funds.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly the Senator does not intend to make the statement that the Federal Government is going into the construction of buildings of the kind he has mentioned, because it is expressly provided in the bill and in every other bill about which I have ever known anything that all such buildings are to be erected by the municipality.

Mr. TAFT. The bill says it shall include the administrative buildings, including the construction of airport administration buildings, but it shall not include hangars.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. But from the fact that the hangars are expressly excluded, I assume that "administrative buildings" covers the ordinary buildings into which people would go, such as the main building at the Washington Airport or any other similar building. That covers the building where tickets are sold and where people buy reading matter, and so forth.

If the Senator wishes to exclude that, that would meet my objection; but I do not understand that the provisions presently proposed do exclude it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Of course, the administrative building is provided for, but the hangars and other buildings men-

tioned in the article the Senator has read are not included.

Mr. TAFT. I myself am rather astonished to find that Mr. McGoldrick, the comptroller of New York City, says that this airport, in which the city of New York without any encouragement or aid from us is spending \$90,000,000, is a sound, self-supporting investment. That is his statement. Certainly there should be some arrangement by which bonds would be issued or some other arrangement made so as to remove this burden from the Federal Government in the case of cities which do not need aid.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If we appropriate \$50,000,000 or \$75,000,000 at this time, there will be nothing to prevent a future Congress from increasing the amount.

Mr. TAFT. Not at all. If it appears that we have the money in the fund or can raise it by a fair system of taxation or that we are on a going basis, I certainly would not object to increasing it. But I think we should have in mind self-supporting investments before we begin to subsidize cities. However, that is another subject. I merely wish to say on this subject that I think there is a clear case for reducing the sum of \$100,000,000 a year for 5 years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this point?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to ask a question. I understand the amount of \$100,000,000 a year for 5 years has been arrived at after a study. I understood yesterday that nearly everyone disavowed that study as being the program for the expenditure of this money. Is that study the basis for the \$100,000,000 to which reference has been made?

Mr. TAFT. I do not know the basis for the \$100,000,000. I assume that, like the bill, it came out of the air as a convenient round figure. I assume it to be somewhat larger than necessary.

Mr. McCARRAN. No; it did not. The bill was reported after studies were made by the Civil Aeronautics Administration and after testimony was given on the program with which the Civil Aeronautics Administration desires to have go forward.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, this matter is very important, and it is one which I believe should be decided after considerable discussion and consideration. It was before our committee for some time. It involved long study on the part of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. I am very much afraid it is not receiving the objective thought which it requires.

I do not believe any of us, no matter how enthusiastic we may be, are able to raise our sights high enough to see the aviation activity which will exist in this country 1 year, 2 years, 5 years, or 10 years hence. We are looking at the subject in very much the same light, perhaps, as that in which we looked into the question of highways and waterways. But here is a brand new industry. If I were to give reasonable figures for the appropriations necessary and needed for the airports which we should have in the

next 5 years, I think my figures would be dwarfed by those which would be found necessary as a result of our experience in the next 5 years.

Mr. President, 3,000,000 of our boys in the armed forces will come home to us air-minded. They will continue their interest in aviation. Three million workers were employed in the aviation plants in the United States, and they are air-minded. In any State of the Union any sizable community which finds itself without an airport will be an unfortunate community. Every community in the United States should immediately plan for the construction of a county-wide airport. The States should have supplemental programs.

Within 10 years we shall have in this country 500,000 airplanes flying the skies. Fifty thousand of them will be in the State of New York. From now on we shall be behind in the construction of airports.

It may be said that technological changes will occur. If we look to the experiences of the immediate past, those technological changes will require larger and more airports. If perchance the technological changes require smaller or fewer airports—although I do not believe that can happen—we can, as has been said half a dozen times during this debate, modify the law, amend the law, or enlarge the law in succeeding sessions of the Congress.

But, Mr. President, there are other considerations which should enter into this discussion. First of all, we are on the eve of a great expansion of aviation. Secondly, facilities for the expansion of aviation are a real investment in security. We are the leader in the aviation world today, but will not remain the leader unless we take the necessary steps. Let us remain the leader. Furthermore, millions of our boys are going to look to aviation for employment when they return from the war. We already have a mounting army of unemployed, and the best statistics which we are able to gather from the most reliable sources tell us that there will be 8,000,000 men out of work by Christmas.

Mr. President, this is the soundest program which is before the Senate at this particular time. It is better than any of the work programs of the past few years, and it should recommend itself because it will provide work for the unemployed in an activity which will pay dividends.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] brought up the question of the Idlewild Airport, and the fact that it is a sound investment. That is true. It may be that there are not many airports in the country which are so attractive and so large in the number of airplanes they can accommodate as is the great New York airport, but there will be hundreds of such airports in the immediate years ahead, and there will be a great need for them.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if we appropriate \$100,000,000 a year for the next 5 years, only such part of the \$100,000,000 will be spent as the States and communities are willing to match, and no State or community will put up half the

money necessary to build airports unless the airports are needed in those States and communities. If they are needed we should not by any means deprive those communities of the airports which they need and which are absolutely necessary to an expansion of industry and commerce in those localities. If the money is not needed, as the Senator from Arkansas and as the Senator from Ohio have implied, then the money will not be spent.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to offer one other thought in conformity with that of the Senator from Vermont. This bill is only an authorization.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. The matter comes back to Congress this year for an appropriation. Congress may cut the appropriation down if it sees fit to do so.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct. This bill is an authorization. If the authorization is insufficient, it can be enlarged. If it is too large, it can be reduced.

Mr. President, when the construction of the LaGuardia Airport was completed it was then considered to be the largest in the world. It was hardly put to use before it was so busy that immediate plans had to be drafted for the construction of another airport. That shows how rapidly the aviation industry is developing.

I believe that we shall be amazed at the growth of this industry during the postwar period. The revenue which will be derived as a result of the commerce developed and the taxes which will be collected as a result of the growth of this industry, will dwarf, in my opinion, the appropriation which we are discussing today. We need the authorization provided in this bill. I am sorry the bill is not more liberal in its treatment of the cities, because it was the cities of the United States which pioneered in the building of airports. Above all, we need the proposed law. It will fit admirably into the postwar picture. We have delayed the adoption of such a measure altogether too long. Recommendations of the Civil Aeronautics Administration have been well studied, and every sizable community in the United States will not only want an airport, but will need one in order to maintain its economic prestige.

So, Mr. President, from the standpoint of security, from the standpoint of the necessity to meet demands, and from the standpoint of the work and opportunity which will be afforded by the enactment of this measure, I hope that it will be passed, and that it will be sent to conference. If during the next session of Congress, or the session following, we feel that we did not raise our sights high enough, or that we raised them too high, we can meet the situation in whatever way we believe to be best. But the planning of the preparation for the construction of airports, and doing the preliminary work in connection with their construction, should be a 5-year program, and I hope the program as contained in the pending bill will remain in the bill when it leaves this Chamber.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, at the present time there is being held a special

meeting of the Committee on Finance. I observe that nearly all the members of the committee, excepting myself, are in attendance at the committee meeting. This afternoon we have a very important matter to consider. I hope, although I will not press for it, that further consideration of the bill may go over until tomorrow. I will not press for it if the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who is in charge of the bill, wishes to continue consideration of the bill to a conclusion today.

Mr. McCARRAN. I had hoped that the bill would go to a vote this afternoon and be disposed of. However, if there are Members of the Senate who cannot be here who would like to have further consideration of the bill go over until tomorrow, I shall not oppose such action.

Mr. BAILEY. I can accommodate myself to the situation by talking only 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the request of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], because I am under the same embarrassment as he is, and hope to attend the meeting of the Finance Committee in order to consider a matter for which we were primarily called back from vacation.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection, and, after holding an executive session further consideration of the bill may go over until tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. Is it the understanding that the Senate is now to recess until tomorrow?

Mr. McCARRAN. The plan is to hold an executive session after which the Senate will recess until tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCARRAN in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sundry nominations of persons for promotion or appointment in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the legislative clerk will proceed to call the Executive Calendar.

TREATIES

The legislative clerk proceeded to read Executive D (79th Cong., 1st sess.).

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may the treaties on the calendar go over?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the treaties will go over, and the legislative clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Claud N. Sapp to be United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Oscar Henry Doyle to be United States attorney for the western district of South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Vice Adm. Louis E. Denfeld to be Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel and Chief of Naval Personnel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Archie F. Howard to be major general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed. That completes the calendar.

Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

RECESS

Mr. McCARRAN. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 12, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 11 (legislative day of September 10), 1945:

IN THE NAVY

Civil Engineer Lewis B. Gombs to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from the 20th day of July 1942.

Admiral Samuel M. Robinson, United States Navy, to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 27th day of August 1945.

Vice Adm. Louis E. Denfeld, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 1st day of September 1945.

Rear Adm. Cato D. Glover, Jr., United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 1st day of December 1943.

Rear Adm. Austin K. Doyle, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 19th day of December 1943.

Rear Adm. Thomas G. W. Settle, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving on special duty with the commander in chief, United States Pacific Fleet, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 10th day of August 1945.

Rear Adm. Milton E. Miles, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, United States naval group, China, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 13th day of August 1945.

Commodore Oscar Smith, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff to the commander in chief, United States Atlantic Fleet, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 12th day of April 1943.

Commodore Benjamin V. McCandlish, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commandant of a naval operating base, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 17th day of September 1943.

Commodore Gordon Rowe, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, United States naval operating base, Midway, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 24th day of April 1944.

Commodore Elliott B. Nixon, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, Caribbean Sea Frontier, and commandant, Tenth Naval District, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 3d day of April 1945.

Commodore James K. Vardaman, Jr., United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, to continue while serving as naval aide to the President, to rank from the 9th day of August 1945.

Commodore William S. Parsons, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving with the atomic bomb project, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 10th day of August 1945.

Commodore William W. Behrens, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, United States naval training center, Bainbridge, Md., and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 22d day of August 1945.

Commodore Mark L. Hersey, Jr., United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, United States naval operating base, Manila Subic, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 24th day of August 1945.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 11 (legislative day of September 10), 1945.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Claud N. Sapp to be United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina.
Oscar Henry Doyle to be United States attorney for the western district of South Carolina.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Louis E. Denfeld, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel and Chief of Naval Personnel, for a term of 4 years, effective from September 15, 1945.

IN THE MARINE CORPS TEMPORARY SERVICE

Archie F. Howard to be a major general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from July 26, 1945.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Christ, the revelation of eternal love and the Saviour of the world, be Thou our personal ideal; sweeten gladness with gratitude and every grief with comfort. We would be guided by Thy spirit—toiling for the good of our fellows, using our influence and our knowledge to soften sorrows, lift the burdens, and hasten the day when contentment and good will shall be among us as an everlasting light. We plead for inward vision that will smooth exhausting difficulty and give to aspiration mastery, progress, and success. Today, give wisdom and direction to the Congress. May it prescribe sovereign remedies that will touch the vitals of the Nation with the largest and the most promising future. Almighty God, be Thou the supreme will in the current of our history, and be the power behind the purpose that sweeps us on as a great people to a glorious destiny. In the name of the Teacher of man, we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include an editorial that appeared in the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass.

Mr. ROMULO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and to include a speech by Senator TYDINGS, also an editorial appearing in the Saturday Evening Post.

Mr. DICKSTEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and to include an editorial appearing in the New York Herald Tribune, and also to extend his remarks and include an article appearing in the New York Daily Mirror of Friday, July 27, 1945.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include several letters.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal entitled "A \$25 Maximum for Jobless Pay" and to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal entitled "The Full Employment Bill."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances and to include in one an article in reference to veterans' hospitals.

Mr. LANDIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances and to include letters in each.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Record on the subject of the creation of an information service in the State Department.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances and to include a resolution in each.

WHERE IS THE MONEY COMING FROM?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am not from Missouri; I am from Pennsylvania. You will have to show me. When we consider the various points recommended by the President in his message to the Congress concerning jobless pay, minimum wages, great agricultural payments, larger congressional pay, and a whole lot more that are going to require enormous sums of money, I want to know where you are going to get the money; when is he going to reduce taxes and still do all of these things; I just do not think it makes sense. He never mentioned that we should have a balanced Budget. I ask the question, Why?

Someone other than Members of Congress should give a definition or explanation of how you are going to fulfill such promises. Certainly it is going to take something else than the remarks that we hear coming from those from Missouri, so you will have to show me.

Why such spending? Why not balance the Budget? Then we can reduce taxes. Then we can get a solvent Government. Oh! I warn the Congress, let us get some sound business administration or else our Nation will suffer with a national debt of over \$260,000,000,000. We must economize. We must not spend, spend, spend, elect, elect, elect. If we do we will perish, perish, perish.

MILITARY PROBLEMS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, there is no question about the country being deeply concerned and, in some sections, angrily aroused at the cumbersome regulations proposed by the military for the release of the men drafted for military purposes.